# "THE LIVING CHURCH" SERIES

Edited by

Professor JOHN E. McFADYEN, D.D.

*United Free Church College, Glasgow.*

Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 6s. net per volume.

IT has of late become the fashion to belittle the Church as of negligible importance in the affairs of the great world. Those alike who love and who deride her often little understand how great has been her influence in the past, and how much she has done, in many departments of thought and activity, for the higher life of the world. The aim of *The Living Church* Series is partly historical, partly practical: it is to help people to realise what a tremendous factor the Church has been in history, and to show how in fresh forms the old needs, problems, and tasks are perpetually re-emerging—in short, to stimulate a fresh appreciation of the Church and to quicken faith in her power to affect the future as she has affected the past.

*The following volumes have been arranged for:*

***The Changing Church and the Unchanging Christ.**
By R. H. COATS, B.D., Birmingham.

**The Church and Art.**
By J. ROBERTSON CAMERON, PH.D., Aberdeen.

**The Church and the Bible.**
By PROF. WILLIAM A. CURTIS, D.LITT., D.D., Edinburgh.

**The Church's Charter.**
By PROF. JOSEPH F. MCFADYEN, M.A., D.D., Kingston, Ontario.

***The Church and the Creeds.**
By DANIEL LAMONT, B.D., Helensburgh.

***The Church's Debt to Heretics.**
By PROF. RUFUS M. JONES, D.D., Haverford, Pa., U.S.A.

**The Church and Education.**
By PROF. ARCH. MAIN, D.LITT., D.D., Glasgow.

**The volumes marked with an asterisk are now ready.**

**The Church and the Healing Ministry.**
By Prof. Samuel McComb, D.D., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., and Elwood Worcester, D.D., Boston, U.S.A.

**The Church and the Hymn Writers.**
By G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D., London.

***The Christian Church and Liberty (4s. 6d. net).**
By A. J. Carlyle, M.A., D.Litt., Oxford.

**The Church and Literature.**
By John A. Hutton, D.D., London.

**The Church and Missions.**
By Robert E. Speer, M.A., LL.D., New York, U.S.A.

**The Church and the Mystics.**
By Evelyn Underhill, London.

***The Church at Prayer.**
By Prof. Percy Dearmer, M.A., D.D., London.

***The Church and the Sacraments.**
By Principal W. M. Clow, D.D., Glasgow.

**The Church and Science.**
By Prof. J. Y. Simpson, D.Sc., F.R.S.E., Edinburgh.

**The Church and the State.**
By Prof. P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., Cambridge.

***The One Body and the One Spirit.**
By Canon T. A. Lacey, M.A., Worcester.

**The Church and Vital Questions of the Hour.**
By J. W. Coutts, M.A., Milngavie.

***The Church and Woman.**
By A. Maude Royden, London.

**Current Cults.**
By Prof. R. E. Welsh, D.D., Montreal.

**The Preachers of the Church.**
By Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D., London.

**Representative Churchmen of Twenty Centuries.**
By Prof. Hugh Watt, B.D., Edinburgh.

***The Story of Social Christianity (2 vols.).**
By F. Herbert Stead, M.A., Warden of Browning Hall, 1894–1921.

***The Thinkers of the Church.**
By Arch. B. D. Alexander, D.D., Langbank.

***The Vocation of the Church.**
By J. H. Leckie, D.D., Edinburgh.

JAMES CLARKE & Co., Ltd., 9 Essex St., Strand, London, W.C.2.

# THE ONE BODY AND THE ONE SPIRIT

# THE ONE BODY AND THE ONE SPIRIT

## A STUDY IN THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

BY

T. A. LACEY, M.A., F.S.A.

CANON OF WORCESTER

NEW YORK: GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

LONDON: JAMES CLARKE & CO., LIMITED

"THE LIVING CHURCH" SERIES

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

# PREFACE

After undertaking, at Professor McFadyen's request, to write on *The Church and Union*, I hesitated for some weeks over the approach to the subject. In a little book on *The Unity of the Church as treated by English Theologians*, written nearly thirty years ago, I was concerned mainly with numerical unity, the unique character of the "one holy catholic and apostolic Church" of the Creed, and the identification of this one society in relation to a multitude of Christian sects. "This unity of the Church," I wrote, "essential, natural, organic, social, is the work of God alone, fixed and immovable as the laws of nature." I barely glanced at "another kind of unity proposed to the Church as an end of moral action," which I distinguished as a "functional unity." What seemed necessary, at that time, was to insist on the conclusion that there are not many Churches of independent origin.

While my book was in the course of publication, the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* of Leo XIII appeared, in which this distinction was worked out with great clearness; it is the will of God that the Church shall be not only *unica* but also *unita*. In this way the ambiguity of the phrase *Una Ecclesia* was removed from Latin theology, and we may hope that it will never return. The effect of the Encyclical may have reached far beyond these limits, or perhaps independent study may have led men generally to the same conclusion; whatever the cause, when I was preparing my Paddock Lectures on "Unity and Schism," in the year 1916, I found less reason for pressing the idea of numerical unity. Even in the United States there was a growing conviction that the Christian Church must be in some sense One. What I now felt called upon to examine was the proposal to arrive at this unity in practice by means of Federation. Such a policy was natural in the United States, where they know what federation means and have proved that it can produce a real national Unit; but it was appearing also in England, where the true meaning of a Federal Union is imperfectly under-

stood. I tried in my lectures to show the inadequacy of this proposal, in view of the fact that the Church has not to be made One, but has been from the first One in the sense intended. I argued that the proper word was not Union but Reunion, the reuniting of a divided family, which through all its quarrels remains at bottom one and the same. Three years later, taking part in a Conference on Christian Reunion at Mansfield College, I found that the word "federation," used at a previous Conference, was dropped. The discussion turned on the idea of an essential unity, actually existing, which should find expression through an act of union. I have compared this with the political unification of Italy. Whatever Metternich might say, Italy was a real unit, as Mazzini insisted, a real nation ; what was needed was the union of its politically divided parts. The analogy is defective, for Italy had never before been a political unit ; the Church of Christ has been an organized unit, and therefore the healing of division is precisely an act of reunion.

Turning over these memories, I resolved to approach the subject on this occasion from the

side of St. Paul's metaphor—to call it no more at present—of the Body of Christ. It seemed helpful, and more helpful as the argument was developed. Consideration of the Body led to a detailed consideration of the Members, and this to a discussion of the Sacred Ministry which I had meant to avoid. The actual existing Unity of the Church, and the hope of its expression by means of restored union, became the subject of the last two chapters.

I have written for the general reader of ordinary education, and have therefore avoided footnotes and references. Familiar quotations from the Bible a reader should be able to find for himself, if he wishes to verify them, and I could hardly do him a greater service than by sending him to look for them. Some rather technical matters have been treated in Notes appearing at the end of the book.

The subject is treated broadly and in the most general terms possible. I have tried to avoid polemic. But very particular polemic lies inevitably behind some of the generalities, and a brief treatment of one moot question seemed to be required for an honest explication of my own way of looking at the principles set out in the sixth chapter. To

make this quite actual I have borrowed, with the Editor's permission, an article which I contributed some time ago to the *Church Quarterly Review*. It is an *ex parte* statement, and nothing else ; but I have the advantage of being able to add, by favour of Dr. Vernon Bartlet, a Reply which has at least the merit of showing that acute controversy can be conducted with courtesy and charity. There will be much controversy before the bond of peace can be knit. What if this may be made a help and not a hindrance ?

I have to thank my colleague, the Archdeacon of Dudley, for reading the proofs and saving me from one mistake in New Testament criticism.

T. A. LACEY.

WORCESTER.

# CONTENTS

# THE ONE BODY AND THE ONE SPIRIT

## CHAPTER I

## THE CHURCH OF GOD

"THERE is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all." The glowing words, the intense conviction, the exuberant language, are entirely Pauline. I cannot doubt that the Epistle to the Ephesians is the work of St. Paul, but of St. Paul in a particular mood of exaltation which affects his style, and even his vocabulary, producing an effect which we do not find elsewhere. The Epistle to the Colossians evidently issues from the same mood, but with more familiarity and quietude. He is often passionate, but not in the same way. This is not the Paul vehemently threatening, urgently demanding the

stability of his disciples, who writes to the Galatians, not the Paul who impatiently rebukes the contentions at Corinth, not the Paul who exposes the doubts and wrestlings of his own soul to the distant Romans ; he is not here strenuous in polemic or ardent in pastoral care ; he is passionate with the passion of a triumph achieved.

What the occasion was, we do not know ;[1] there had evidently been a grave risk of disunion, and it evidently rose out of the divergent movements of Jewish and Gentile believers. He is addressing his Gentile converts more exclusively than elsewhere ; they are men who had been "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of the promise," but now they have been "made nigh in the blood of Christ." The effect of the Gospel has been to "break down the middle wall of partition," which kept Jew and Greek asunder, making of the twain one, and "reconciling them both in one body unto God through the Cross." They are become one as Christ is one, who is "head over all things to the church which is his body."

[1] See below, p. 82.

St. Paul was doubtless a man of many moods, and we have but sparse fragments of his vast correspondence, so that we have no call to be surprised if these display widely differing characteristics of manner and temper. For the same reason there are sprung upon us phrases, evidently familiar, formed and brought into use during months which are, for us, periods of silence. "The church, which is his body." The phrase comes in naturally, without any introduction, as belonging to the common speech of those addressed; and it is used to illustrate a theme, as one that needs no explanation. We ourselves, also, have become so used to it that we are not struck by its violence. Is it a metaphor? Then certainly violent. Is it more than metaphor, an expression of reality? Then is it still more remarkable.

I propose to examine the source of this metaphor —so to call it for the moment—in our slender store of St. Paul's own words. But something preliminary is needed. The Church is the Body of Christ. In that statement there are two terms, and each of them demands attention.

The Church—the *Ecclesia*—what is it? We

find the word in the earliest of St. Paul's epistles, whether priority be given to Thessalonians or to Galatians. That is the first dated use of it in the Christian sense. It appears full grown, not put forward tentatively, but used as the accepted designation of Christian communities at Thessalonica or in Judaea. But simultaneously it appears also in a different sense. Six times in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Corinthians St. Paul speaks of "the *ecclesia* of God." On two of these occasions he makes the sorrowful confession, "I persecuted the *ecclesia* of God." What was this, and why so named?

The Greek word was obviously current in its native sense of a civic assembly. It could be so used, either precisely or in a looser fashion as when St. Luke applies it to the tumultuous mob led by Demetrius at Ephesus. But no such use will account for St. Paul's language. The "*ecclesia* of God" which he had persecuted was in no sense an assembly. It was a multitude scattered in Judaea and beyond as far as Damascus. The source of the expression must be sought elsewhere.

It is found in the Septuagint. The Alexandrian

translators rendered the two Hebrew words *'ēdāh* and *ḳāhāl* indiscriminately by *synagoge* and *ecclesia*. Both Hebrew words stood for the congregation or assembly of the people of Israel, with a slight difference of emphasis; the one looked rather to the people assembled, the other to the actual assembly. Both were capable of passing on to mean the people at large. A striking example is in Nehemiah xiii. 1, where a Deuteronomic rule excluding certain persons from the assembly is interpreted to mean exclusion from Israel. In Ezra ii. 64 the "whole congregation" means the total number of those returned from Babylon. In the seventy-fourth Psalm "thy congregation which thou hast purchased of old" can be nothing less than the whole stock of Israel.

The two words *synagoge* and *ecclesia* run through the text of the Septuagint without any distinction of meaning. They are, in fact, interchangeable.[1] But their fortunes diverged. The latter seems to have passed out of use among the Hellenist Jews; the former was retained with a serious reduction of its significance. It no longer stood for the

[1] See Note A, p. 229.

whole nation or for a national assembly, but was made the name of those minor organized societies by which the social and religious affairs of the Jews were administered, whether in Judaea or in the Dispersion. The name of the meeting was then appropriated to the building in which it met, the familiar synagogue which still endures.

It follows that when St. Paul spoke of persecuting the *ecclesia* of God, he used a form of speech that was obsolete in his day. I do not mean that it would be unfamiliar to the Galatians whom he was addressing ; he lets it fall so naturally in dictating the epistle that we must suppose it to be already accepted. He may himself have brought it into use, but of that we have no evidence. It was in use, and it stood without explanation for the whole company of Christian believers. How shall we account for it ?

I think it can be explained only as an archaism, a conscious archaism drawn from the current version of the Holy Scriptures. A motive for this curious development can be found without much difficulty.

Christianity began as a movement within the

national and religious polity of Judaism. To the Jews at Rome, when St. Paul arrived there, it was known as a sect (αἵρεσις) among themselves. St. Paul himself had recognized this, though perhaps demurring to the description, when defending himself before Felix at Caesarea : "I confess that after the way which they call a sect I serve the God of our fathers." That the description was not derogatory may be gathered from his later assertion before Agrippa, "After the strictest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." It was still for him "our religion," though with a difference, and he had emphasized this by reminding Felix that the tumult which led to his arrest was due to the fact that he had "gone up to worship at Jerusalem."

This was consistent with his whole practice. Everywhere he claimed a hearing in the synagogues. What he taught there seems to have been called distinctively "the Way," a word of much interest which need not here detain us. Only when the Way was resisted with contumely and tumult, or perhaps with formal expulsion, did he withdraw. St. Luke describes two such incidents, at Corinth

and at Ephesus. At Ephesus, we are told, he "separated the disciples," and found a home for them in the School of Tyrannus, a tantalizing piece of information. At Corinth the whole synagogue, with individual exceptions, seems to have been so unanimous against him that he openly declared his intention of dealing only with Gentiles, and rather provocatively established himself close at hand in the house of a Proselyte of the Gate. One might expect him to organize a new synagogue in the School of Tyrannus. At Corinth he would lack material for this, but the obscure story of the charge laid against him before the Proconsul seems to show that he was suspected of attempting it. The charge was that he "persuaded men to worship God contrary to the law." Judaism was a lawful cult,[1] recognized and protected wherever the authority of Rome extended, and a regular synagogue was therefore a legally privileged institution. The attempted establishment of a rival might be treated as a contravention of the law. Christians could remain legally within the Jewish polity only by

[1] See the recent treatment of this subject by Merrill, *Essays in Early Christian History*, pp. 43 seqq.

connexion with an established synagogue. The hope of those who accepted the Gospel was that all Jews might be drawn to their side. "My heart's desire," St. Paul wrote to the Romans, "and my supplication to God is for them, that they may be saved." In this way the religion of the Gospel would become a *religio licita*, and St. Paul's general attitude towards the Empire shows how he would have valued that position.

The hope had already faded when he first came to Corinth. The admission of Gentiles to the Christian fellowship, now settled in principle and growing in practice, made it more difficult to suppose that the bulk of the nation would come in. The cleavage between the Synagogue and the followers of the Way was widening and deepening; how should it be regarded? St. Paul showed his mind at Corinth. With a telling gesture he put the blame on the Synagogue: "Your blood be on your own heads!" It was they who stood condemned, not he; it was he who cast them off, not they who ejected him. "I am clean." It was a daring assertion, made in connexion with his departure to the Gentiles; as if he should say,

" I shall still be of the holy seed ; you the defiled." Even earlier, at Antioch of Pisidia, he and Barnabas are said to have spoken in the same vein : " It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you ; but since ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, we turn to the Gentiles." We are not on as firm ground here as in dealing with St. Paul's own writings, but the Lucan narrative points directly to that which he afterwards taught explicitly in the Epistle to the Romans, the scriptural doctrine of the Remnant. When the chiefs of the nation had rejected Jesus the Christ, the bulk of the nation adhering to them, the followers of Jesus were become like Jacob when Esau was cast off, like the seven thousand of Elijah who did not bow the knee to Baal, like the handful that escaped from the Exile to rebuild Jerusalem. They were the true Israel ; the rest were fallen away. They were the original stock, into which the wild branches of the Gentiles might be engrafted. And these new proselytes were to be absorbed into the Remnant, so as to become themselves the true Israel. Even while he was forbidding his converts

in Galatia to conform to the practice of the Synagogue, he urged them to realize their part in the Covenant of Abraham. When the dispute about Jewish observances was ended, he could write to the Philippians with characteristic paradox, "We are the Circumcision." There seems to have been no synagogue at all at Philippi.

This, then, was the "*ecclesia* of God." The new Israel, so to call it, needed a distinctive title, especially among users of the Greek language. The current terms of the Jewish polity would be misleading, and perhaps dangerous. They would suggest the national exclusiveness of Judaism, and they would perhaps cause legal difficulties in view of Jewish privileges within the Roman Empire. Their use might imply unlawful usurpation of those privileges, or conversely the subjection of the claimants to the effective control of the established synagogues. A new title was therefore needed, but it was carefully sought in the tradition of the Old Testament, and drawn from the Septuagint. The Aramaic speaking Christians of the East seem to have felt no such difficulty, and they adhered to the current Jewish terms, but in

Northern Syria a similar archaism was ultimately adopted.[1]

The conventionality of the Greek term is proved by its passage without change into Latin, and thence into the Romance and Celtic languages of Europe. There is no significance in the fact that other languages adopted another word, also of Greek origin, for it has been used only as a rendering of St. Paul's term, which thus determines its meaning. We may therefore drop all appearance of pedantry, and speak naturally of the "Church of God," in the sense determined.

But St. Paul speaks of churches, as well as of the Church of God which is one, and this also in the earliest of his writings which we possess. It is clear that "the churches of Judaea," to which he tells the Galatians he was personally unknown, were local Christian communities in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; and he exhibits them as models to "the Church of the Thessalonians." Rebuking the Corinthians for a disorderly practice, he tells them that "the churches of God" have no such custom. He asserts that "the care of

[1] See Note A. p. 230.

all the churches" was incumbent on him. We hear of the church "in the house" of Aquila or of Philemon, which may be the Christian household of those presumably wealthy persons, but is more probably a community using the house for its place of meeting. "Gaius, my host and of the whole church," who is mentioned in the appendix to the Epistle to the Romans, seems to be rendering a like service, and we are reminded of the house of the Laterani, which in a later age became the headquarters of the Roman Church. Whatever the place of meeting may be, he can speak of "the whole church assembled together" at Corinth, and pass on to bid women "keep silence in the churches," where the word evidently stands for the actual meeting. So also, immediately above, he commends orderly behaviour "as in all the churches of the saints."

It should be observed that in the earlier epistles this restricted sense appears much more frequently than the wider sense which we have been considering. From this circumstance it has been precariously inferred that the restricted sense was the earliest in which the word *ecclesia* was used,

that it was applied first to scattered Christian communities, or to their meetings, and was afterwards transferred to a newly conceived union of them all in a single community. Thus the churches would be prior, both temporally and logically, to the Church.

This argument seems to involve two misconceptions. In the first place, it presupposes far more knowledge of the growth of Christian language than we possess. With the doubtful exception of the Epistle of James and some fragments elsewhere, St. Paul's Epistles are the earliest Christian writings that have come down to us, and in these the two uses of the word *ecclesia* are found already established. The frequency of one use or the other cannot indicate priority of origin, for it is determined by the subject matter of the Epistle; the recent history of the word lies behind, and is veiled. In the second place, the argument supposes a current use of the word which would make it a natural and suitable name for a small religious company or for its meetings, a substitute for *synagoge*. Nothing of the kind is available. The great public assembly of a Greek city was of a

wholly different character, and the word so used would perhaps, with its inevitable associations, be rather repellent than attractive. Moreover its transference within a short period from a small local gathering to the widely dispersed society of Christian believers would be a very violent transition, suggested by no contemporary experience known to us.

On the other hand, the primary use of the word suggested above would be natural to those familiar with the Greek text of the Old Testament. For them the word itself was a resounding claim, asserting their continuity and identity with the old "*ecclesia* of God." We can but conjecture the origin of this use. The text of the Acts was written too late to be a guide, and the word appears there in its ultimate development. It may very well have started on its course at Antioch. It may have been the invention of St. Paul. If Stephen, the Hellenist, made his defence before the Sanhedrin in Greek, and if the report in the Acts was made by St. Paul himself—no improbable supposition—his reference to "the *ecclesia* in the wilderness" may have been the starting-point. Taken

in connexion with the idea of the Remnant, which he was obviously approaching when interrupted, it may have worked yeastily in the mind of Saul, disposing him to his conversion. But these are conjectures. The one solid fact that we have is the appearance of the word with its two or three shades of meaning in the earliest Christian writings now extant.

Standing in the first instance for the whole "*ecclesia* of God," it would easily pass over to the other meaning, and be attached to local congregations. There was a precedent. It had only to achieve in a dozen years the transition which *synagoge* had made in a couple of centuries. I cannot agree with those who see in this secondary use an indication of the profound thought that each several congregation is in some sort equivalent to the whole Church. That thought may be true, and we shall have to take account of it when we are considering the Body of Christ; but it is not needed in accounting for the application of the name of the whole Church to a part. The analogy of the Synagogue suffices.

In tracing the origin of the name by which the

Church was called in the first age, we have found also the significance of that name, and have obtained light on the governing conception which led to its adoption. In doing this I have ignored the two passages of St. Matthew's Gospel, chapters xvi. 18, and xviii. 17, in which the word *ecclesia* occurs. I have done this partly because of the uncertain date of the Gospel, partly because of the difficulty of supposing the word *ecclesia* to have stood in the original text. The two developed uses of the word are both represented, and are used as if with a familiarity which seems to demand a rather late date. This conclusion, however, is based on the foregoing investigation. If, on the other hand, it could be shown that the word was actually used in the two recorded sayings, "On this rock I will build my church," and "Tell it unto the church," then a great part of the foregoing investigation would fall to pieces.

Against the critics who would refer the former passage to a date in the second century, it was urged by Hort that "the application of the term *ecclesia* by the Apostles is much easier to understand if it were founded on an impressive saying

of our Lord." [1] But this argument involves the assumption that our Lord used the very word in question. To what extent the Greek language was current in Judaea and Galilee is doubtful. That it was widely known is certain; that the population was generally bilingual cannot be affirmed. I gather that Hort himself did not suppose our Lord to have used it in conversation with the disciples. If not, the tradition of the original saying would not bear upon the adoption of the term *ecclesia*, which would be introduced by the Greek editor of the Gospel as the current term of his own day equivalent to the original. What was the original? We do not know, and a conjecture is not very valuable.

When we pass from the word to its content, there is more to be said. The metaphor of building is frequent in the Old Testament, and prominent in prophecies of the captivity and the return. It passes from a half-literal sense in the verse of a psalmist, "The Lord doth build up Jerusalem, and gather together the outcasts of Israel," to the

[1] *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 9. It is superfluous to acknowledge obvious indebtedness to Hort's brilliant lectures. One ventures to differ from him only under his own guidance.

wholly metaphorical phrases of Jeremiah : " I will bring them again to this land ; and I will build them and not pull them down," or again, " I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them as at the first." Our Lord's words are evidently an echo of these phrases. We may read as a commentary on them what was said by James in the Council at Jerusalem, with his free quotation from Amos : " After these things I will return, and I will rebuild the tabernacle of David, which is fallen ; and I will rebuild the ruins thereof." Here is again the promise of the Remnant, enforced by the Judaean James in connexion with the dispensation of the Gospel as vividly as by the Catholic Paul ; and we observe how deftly he interweaves with it a promise for " the residue of men." He links together the two hopes of Israel restored and of the Gentiles won. We may reckon confidently that the Evangelist who belonged to the school of James found in the record of the scene at Caesarea Philippi the first announcement of this building. It would not suggest, I think, the revival of an archaic word ; but it enounced the

principle which was afterwards expressed by that revival.

It is the principle of the continuity of the Church of God in the faithful Remnant at every crisis of history, and especially in the supreme crisis of passage from the Old Testament to the New. The Church is not a new thing, an afterthought, an appendix to the Gospel. It is integral to the Gospel.

## CHAPTER II

## THE BODY OF CHRIST

THIS Church is called the Body of Christ. Is the phrase metaphorical, or is it a statement of reality? If metaphorical, we may learn from it something of the nature of that which is so described; but we must learn cautiously, for inferences from metaphor are at best precarious. If it be a statement of reality, we shall be on surer ground.

For us who use the English language it is natural to call the Church a Body. Either by reason of the Latin *corpus* and its French derivative, or for more native reasons, we are accustomed so to designate any company or association of men, especially such as are formed for some kind of governmental function. A nation is a Body Politic; a group of men administering the business of the nation is a Public Body. There is metaphor in this, and by an extension of the metaphor we

freely speak of the Members of such a Body; so freely, indeed, as to forget the source of the term. Except in poetry, its metaphorical use has almost ousted the natural use; in ordinary speech it would be reckoned an affectation to speak of our limbs as members of our bodies.

The comparison of a city or nation with the human body, out of which the metaphor has grown, is fairly obvious and very ancient. The fable of Menenius Agrippa, the dispute between the Belly and the other Members, appears in many literatures diverse in time and place. But the finished metaphor is less universal, and perhaps nowhere is it as commonplace as with us. We might expect to find it in the copious Greek literature. The initial comparison is there; in a highly refined form it supplies the framework of Plato's Republic; it was used more crudely by the Stoics. A comparison it remained. The Greek word *soma* had a wide range of meaning, but it does not seem to have been used in the sense of a body-politic.[1]

There is, therefore, no reason for supposing

[1] See Note C, *Μέλος. Σῶμα*, p. 232.

that St. Paul found a phrase ready to his hand when he called the Church the Body of Christ. Yet the phrase appears in the Epistle to the Ephesians, used with a promptitude and an obviousness which indicate familiarity. It was evidently a matured commonplace. If we examine its use at this stage, and then look back to St. Paul's earlier writings, we may find both the content of the phrase and its origin.

The Epistle opens with a dithyrambic passage, an ode in all but metre to the glory of the risen Christ, in whom all things are gathered up together, the complement of all times. This idea of complement, of fulfilment, reappears at the end of the passage, where the apostle, after saying that God has put all things in subjection under the feet of the Christ, comes to the climax with the words "and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth for himself all things in all." [1] As climax this must mean something beyond the universal

[1] I take *πληρουμένου* as middle. To make it passive, with Dr. Armitage Robinson, is to provide a weak duplication of the idea of *πλήρωμα*.

reign of the Christ, beyond the summing up of history in his triumph; the church is the body of Christ himself, and his supreme glory is to be the head of this body; nay, this body is his complement, so that without it he who fills all things on his own account would himself be incomplete. The paradox is truly Pauline. But, if the thought is paradoxical, the phrase itself, "the church which is his body" comes in with all the appearance of an accepted commonplace.

The next entry of the word is much less significant. The enmity of Jew and Gentile is ended, for the work of Christ has been to "reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross." This one body must certainly be interpreted as the Body of Christ, but, so far as the wording goes, *soma* might stand here in the recognized sense of a solid mass. Following upon this we have the Gentiles described as made into a combined body [1] with the Jews; and here again, though the thought of the Body of Christ is not far away, the language is more ordinary.

[1] *Σύσσωμα*, a word not found elsewhere, but presumably current, since Aristotle uses a derivative, *συσσωματοποιεῖται*, of a combination of air and water. *De Mundo*, iv. 32.

Then comes the great doctrine of practical unity among Christians: "Eager to guard the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace: one body and one spirit, as ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all." I put aside for the moment delicate questions about the meaning of "spirit" in this place, to observe that the collocation of body and spirit forbids us to take the word *soma* in the reduced sense which would be possible in the last two quotations. Nothing short of a living body can be intended, and this living body can be nothing else but the Church which is the Body of Christ. Here, then, it becomes clear that St. Paul is not using a fanciful and metaphorical expression. The spiritual life of which he is speaking was certainly for him the most real of human realities; the faith and hope of the Christian calling were real experiences; baptism was a very concrete reality; the Lord is here the real historic Christ; God the Father is the supreme reality. Equally real, and no metaphor, is the one living Body. And St. Paul had no common tradition of

language behind him, such as we have, that would enable him to speak naturally of associated believers as a "body." He is dependent on his own tremendous affirmation that the Church, this living body, is the Body of Christ.

Then the ascended Lord is said to have poured out gifts on those who are in the one Body, the effect of which is that some are made apostles, others prophets or evangelists, others pastors and teachers, all exercising their proper functions "unto the building up of the Body of Christ." I am tempted to wonder whether Greek physicians ever spoke of "body-building" as we do; but the enquiry is needless, for the metaphor of building is well established in the Old Testament, and was employed by St. Paul so freely that he could use it even in a bad sense of encouragement to do evil.[1] Moreover, he has previously in this epistle figured the Church as a temple growing to completion from the foundation. He was never careful of consistency in metaphor, and here he is perhaps mixing two. They are strictly comparable; that

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 10. *Ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν.*

other also may be something more than metaphor, and the two illustrate each other, but we had better stick to the one with which we are engaged. We then observe that the God-given functions operate not only for the Body as a whole, but also for individuals within the Body, in relation to "the full equipment of the saints."[1] So equipped, they are to grow up together, in unity of faith and knowledge, until they become as one full-grown man, attaining "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." We are thrown back to the beginning of the epistle, where the Church itself is said to be this fulness. A clear thought emerges from a cloud of words. Christ will be fulfilled in the Church only as all who are in the Church become full-grown as Christ himself; they are to "grow up altogether into him who is the head." So the Body is at present a developing organism. There is still an apparent confusion, for Christ is now the whole Body, now the Head; but that is straightened out by the conception of the Head as the formative and governing element, "from

[1] *Καταρτισμὸν.* Not "perfecting," which comes later, *εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον*, but in preparation for that.

which the whole Body fitly framed and knit together through every ligament of the apparatus,[1] according to the measured energy of each several part, makes the growth of the Body until it is built in charity."

This is more than metaphor. What metaphor could be so sustained, so consistent? St. Paul is giving a realistic description of a reality, familiar to him. One thing remains: to fit the individual Christian into the frame. It is soon done. "Wherefore, putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbour: for we are members one of another." Observe: not members of the Body. That, of course, for the one word provides the other; but each one is so identified with the whole that each is a member of every one. Union can be stretched no further.

The Epistle to the Colossians is so closely connected with that addressed to the Ephesians,[2] especially in regard to the phrases which I have quoted, that only two details adding a touch of precision need be examined.

[1] Dr. Armitage Robinson's perfect, though not beautiful, rendering of *διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας*.

[2] See Note D, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 234.

The conception of the Church as the fulfilment or complement of Christ is illustrated by the remarkable passage in which he speaks of his own troubles, evidently meaning those which had come upon him as champion of the cause of the Gentiles : " What is lacking of the afflictions of Christ I am vicariously filling up in my flesh on behalf of his body which is the church." The passion of Christ is in a sense not complete until the whole Church, having suffered with him, is glorified with him, and St. Paul rejoices to think that his own afflictions are contributing to that result.

The other place that I would mention is that in which he speaks of ordinances proper to the Old Testament as " a shadow of the things to come," adding, " but the body is Christ's." Here the word *soma* is used in the ordinary Stoic sense of reality,[1] but a larger meaning is given to it, as he goes on to contrast a lingering adherence to shadows with " holding fast the Head " on whom the whole Body is dependent. The implication is that the Church of the New Testament does more than

[1] The distinction of *σῶμα* and *φαντασία*.

continue the Church of the Old Testament; it is the solid reality of which the former things were but a sketch.

We have now gathered up St. Paul's fully developed doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. He does not recur to it in the brief writings of later date which have come down to us. Neither is it mentioned in any other apostolic text now extant. The Johannine figure of the Vine and the Branches seems to enter into competition with it, and is preferable as metaphor, because simpler; it is not complicated by the relation of the Head to the Members; Christ the true Vine answers to Christ the whole Body, and the branches are the Vine as the members are the Body. But St. Paul's business was not to simplify a metaphor; he set out to describe in metaphorical fashion a complex reality. If others were slow to adopt his description—a slowness which can be neither affirmed nor denied—the Epistle to the Ephesians shows that it was sufficiently known and accepted to be used as a matter of course.

It was a rapid development. Four or five years earlier St. Paul himself was but approaching

this conception. We turn to the group of epistles which belong to his period of conflict, and observe in them its emergence. There is nothing about it in the two letters to Thessalonica, but silence proves nothing. Neither is it mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians, though here we shall find something bearing on its inception. We come to the two epistles addressed to Corinth, pieced together from at least four, which were written within the space of some months. Here we pick up traces which need careful examination. In the sixth chapter of our First Epistle St. Paul is dealing with perversions of things said by him in a previous letter.[1] Two abrupt sayings are quoted, and false deductions from them are repelled: "All things are lawful for me," and "Every sin that a man doeth is without the body." We know the kind of teaching in which he abounded. Conduct is not hedged about for Christians by a minuted code of observances; no bare act in itself is sinful, for sin resides in the will of the doer; bodily pollutions are not sins. Sound principles, but

[1] Entirely lost, unless, as some think, there is a short section of it incorporated in our Second Epistle, viz. vi. 14–vii. 1.

dangerous in the atmosphere of Corinth. There they were interpreted to mean that fornication is no sin. Sentences directed against Jewish rigorism were read as giving licence to Greek dissoluteness. We have to consider the circumstances. The harlots of Corinth were sacred women, devoted to the temple-service of Aphrodite ; no shame rested on their calling, or on those who frequented them. The Gentile converts of the city would know the mind of their Jewish neighbours on the subject, but this might be put down to a scruple of ceremonial uncleanness or of contact with Gentile worship. Freed from these scruples by St. Paul's teaching, they might claim as much liberty in this respect as in respect of circumcision or of "meats offered to idols." It seems clear that they did so, and St. Paul was in a difficulty. Unchastity of a kind condemned by the public opinion of the city, such as the incest dealt with in the fifth chapter, he could smite with severe discipline, but he insisted in another connexion—or perhaps in the same case—that in such procedure judgment should be passed "by the many." St. Augustine fell back on this principle when combating the divisive

puritanism of the Donatists. The Church, he said, must tolerate much evil, as tares among the wheat, for correction has to be administered by the many, and therefore it is ineffective when offenders have a multitude of sympathizers; it is effective only when the general sense of the community is against them.[1] That is an accurate statement of St. Paul's difficulty at Corinth. Nor was it only a temporary difficulty. The Epistles of St. Cyprian supply melancholy proof of its continuance. Indeed, during the period of severest penitential discipline it was found impracticable to make fornication one of the capital sins for which penance was imposed. St. Basil the Great, challenged to say why an unfaithful husband should not be treated in the same way as an adulterous wife, had to reply that an established custom of the Church forbade him to put a man to penance for sinning with an unmarried woman. There was no such custom confronting St. Paul, but he laid the foundation of it by a necessary tenderness for sins which did not shock the general sense of the Church.

[1] *Contra Ep. Parmen.*, iii.

What, then, was he to do? He tried to reason with the perverse mind, and his argument is what concerns us. "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats," you may justly say, dismissing both; always remembering that both will perish. But you cannot say in the same sense that the body is for fornication. "The body is for the Lord," and Christ has a lien upon it; equally "the Lord is for the body," being the Saviour thereof. Then he appeals to something which is a recognized element of Christian belief: "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?"

We must pause, for we seem to have struck the trail that we are seeking. What do these words mean? To anyone familiar with the developed doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ, they may seem to implicate the whole of it. But that is not a safe conclusion. The Greek word *melos* does indeed mean the limb of an animal body, but it has a much wider range of meaning.[1] Let us continue the argument. "Shall I, then, take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot?" Separation from Christ is the

[1] See Note C, *Μέλος. Σῶμα*, p. 232.

main thought, but the second thought is important. "Know ye not that he who is joined to a harlot is one body? For the twain, it is said, shall become one flesh." It is a paradoxical extension of the union of man and woman in marriage, which had a far-reaching effect in the Canon Law touching the relation of affinity. Here it seems an almost desperate argument, and one can imagine these Corinthians rejecting it with derision; connexion with a harlot, they might urge, is merely temporary, in fact as by intention. But St. Paul seems to look at something beyond, which could not be gainsaid: "Know ye not?" He adds, by way of contrast, "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." [1] He sets this union at a higher level than the other, but they are truly parallel. Later in the epistle we come to another parallel. To take part in a sacrifice to idols was to have "communion with demons," precisely as in Christian worship there was communion with Christ. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup

[1] We must not attribute to St. Paul the modern antithesis of body and spirit; a "spiritual body" was for him no incongruous expression.

of demons ; ye cannot partake of the Lord's table and of a table of demons." This throws light on the previous parallel between union with Christ and union with a harlot. Commerce with a temple-prostitute at Corinth was an act of religious significance ; an act, as St. Paul might say, of communion with the demon Aphrodite. It was not a mere indulgence of the flesh, comparable to a casual eating of sacrificial meats, which a Christian might freely allow himself. Fornication was brought within the category of idolatry, and the very men who were claiming licence would shrink from that. Their conscience was so far informed. "Know ye not?" could be said to them with appealing force.

Can we now settle the meaning of the term "member of Christ" at this stage of St. Paul's thought? The Epistle to the Galatians will tell us something. "Through your faith you are all sons of God in Christ Jesus ; for as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." Here are three ways of expressing the relation of the believer to Christ. They are all found elsewhere, evidently as common forms of speech ;

here they are brought together in immediate dependence on a remarkable statement which explains them.

We have seen that the Christian Church began as the faithful Remnant of Israel, the true inheritors of the Promise. St. Paul is here showing how the Gentiles share the inheritance. The Judaizers who were trying to wreck his work in Galatia would not exclude the Gentiles, but insisted on introducing them as proselytes into the existing Remnant, requiring them to observe at least some provisions of the Law; the more exacting opponents of St. Paul went beyond "those with James" in requiring even circumcision. Against these requirements he tries to show that all alike, Jews and Gentiles, must be received into the renewed Israel on equal terms. For this purpose he propounds an extraordinary interpretation of Scripture: "To Abraham were the promises spoken and to his seed; he saith not, 'And to his seeds,' as of many; but as of one, 'And to thy seed,' which is Christ." [1] We may think the exegesis intolerable, and yet acknowledge the truth of the

[1] See Note E, *The Seed of Abraham*, p. 235.

conclusion. Jesus alone was the true Remnant. Two sayings of the Johannine Gospel are called to mind: "Will ye also go away?" and "Ye shall be scattered, and shall leave me alone." The latter is also in Mark: "All ye shall be offended, for it is written: I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." Before Caiaphas, before Pilate, Jesus stands absolutely alone as the true seed of Abraham. He, the Remnant, returns from the exile of death. Only by being gathered to him can anyone inherit the Promise. That is equally true of James and of the remotest Gentile in a village of Galatia. We shall find this explicit in the Epistle to the Ephesians: "He came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh." It is implicit in the argument to the Galatians, the very core of the argument. Therefore all alike were baptized "into Christ," all alike "put on Christ," all are included "in Christ." He sums it up: "If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, inheritors according to promise." I take that word "Christ's," as used in this connexion, to explain the term "member of Christ."

So far there is nothing to suggest the further term "Body of Christ," and I think we may be sure that it had not yet occurred to St. Paul. If it had, I do not see how it could have been kept out of the argument to the Galatians.

I return to the First Epistle to the Corinthians. In the tenth chapter is the important passage: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation of the blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not a participation of the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, though many, are one body; for we all share the one loaf." We may seem to be approaching our term, but the appearance will not bear examination. The Body of Christ here cannot be equated with the Church; the symbolic interpretation conceived in that sense by some of the Fathers, and worked into some ancient liturgies, was a devout fancy consequent upon the developed use of the phrase, and not a veiled sense leading up to it. The "one body" here is parallel—with reverence be it said—to the "one body" of the harlot connexion; it is the effect of communion, and the point is that the Church as a whole, not only

each several communicant, is "joined to Christ" in that sacred mystery.

Yet I would not deny that in urging this St. Paul himself may have been led insensibly to the point which at last we are reaching. With an abrupt change of subject, he passes on to the consideration of spiritual gifts in the Church. There is one Spirit, but there are many "charismata"; there are many services rendered to the one Lord, many kinds of energy issuing from the one God. And these are bestowed diversely upon believers individually selected. This suggests at once the old and familiar analogy of the body and the members. The idea of "one body" is recalled, but with reference to another sacred mystery: "We were all baptized into one body . . . and were all made to drink of one Spirit." I must insist that the word *soma* is used here in the sense of the whole mass of a thing really existing, a commonplace of the current Stoic philosophy. We were baptized into Christ: that is accepted. We were also baptized into a real unit, a body, the Church of God. We are, therefore, in the sense already indicated, members of Christ; we are

also members of this body. The analogy of animal structure suggests that in this body are differentiated members, each necessary to each, and to the whole ; each set in its own place according to the will of God the Creator. St. Paul extends the analogy : as is the body, " so also is Christ." It is still analogy, not yet metaphor. But as he develops the relation of membership, metaphor emerges. It comes with a flash of insight : " Now ye are Christ's Body." He seems to have in mind the local community, " the Church of God which is at Corinth." But he passes on at once to the Church at large and its differentiated members : " God set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers," and so on to others. Not all are apostles, not all are miracle-workers, not all speak with tongues ; there is order in these things, ordered by God, and subordination is not obscurely suggested.

So far we do not seem to get beyond metaphor, and when he is writing to the Romans, some months later, he falls back even to the level of analogy : " As we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office ; so we,

the many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another." We have different gifts, and we must soberly take our stations, "according as God divided to each one a measure of faith." Perhaps St. Paul did not venture to spring on those strangers at Rome the strong metaphor upon which he had come when writing to his familiars at Corinth. But within a surprisingly short space of time the metaphor hardened into reality, and he could send to the Churches of Asia a formal encyclical, speaking without circumlocution of the Church which is Christ's Body.

In this form his statement has passed into the doctrinal system of the Church, where it has played a considerable part in the regulation of religious thought. The One Body and the One Spirit are correlative. The Church is not a mere gathering of individuals ; it is a living organism, and its life is the life of the Spirit, which is in the whole Body, as it is indivisibly in each several member. Something may be here, drawn from Stoicism but transfigured. For the Stoics the whole universe was a living thing, a Body, the life or spirit of which was God—God exclusively immanent, without

any transcendence. But into the Church are poured spiritual *charismata* from Beyond, the gift of the transcendent God. This calls for careful consideration.

I have insisted that much more than metaphor is intended when the Church is called the Body of Christ. It is not altogether as when the Lord himself said, " I am the vine, ye are the branches." As imagery, the Body and the Members correspond closely to the Vine and the Branches, but St. Paul used the former imagery, and the Church continues to use it, as expressing a fact, an historic fact, in the relation of Christ to the Church. But we have seen that the phrase came into use as metaphor, and the actual language retains a metaphorical character. There follows a need of caution in arguing from it. The danger of drawing inferences from a metaphor is unquestionable. Robert Moberly succumbed, I think, to this danger when he made the strange remark : " Whatever Christ is, the Church is ; as reflecting, nay, in a real sense even as being, Himself." [1] As one reads, a protest rises to the lips : " But Christ is the Lord,

[1] *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 244.

God ! " Then one observes that even the wording of St. Paul is not followed. To say that the Church is the Body of Christ is not the same as to say that the Church is Christ. Standing on guard against this danger, can we infer anything about the Spirit as the life of the Church ?

It has been alleged that St. Paul did not distinguish between the Christ and the Spirit. He was certainly not careful to do so, and at times it is not easy to determine whether he means by the " Spirit of Christ " the human spirit of Jesus or that which the ascended Christ sent down from heaven as a Gift to men, distinct from himself. But the distinction is necessary in the background of the whole argument which we have been following, and it comes to the fore when in his carefully reasoned treatise to the Romans he speaks of " the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead," and adds the assurance that this Spirit " dwelleth in you." On the other hand, one observes that that Body of Christ which is the Church must be thought of as living. There is no dead body of Christ. But a living body is quite as much soul as flesh. I think we may press the language so

far. Then the normal and natural life of the Church which is his Body will be the Soul, the human Spirit of Christ, and the gifts poured out by the transcendent Spirit from above will be in comparison supernatural. If this be allowed, spiritual values in the Church may be variously assorted, but it will be no easy task, nor is it urgent.

It is evident that the Body of Christ stands properly for the whole human nature of Christ, even as the Flesh of Christ does when St. John says that the Word was made Flesh. Returning now to Moberly, I find the meaning of his rashly worded sentence to be precisely this to which we are now come. For he is arguing that since Christ is Priest, and what Christ is the Church is, therefore the Church has a priestly character. But the Priesthood of Christ is an endowment of his human nature. Therefore what the argument requires is that the Church shall "reflect, nay, in a real sense, even be," not the whole Christ but the Manhood of Christ. To say this will not be to diminish the personal presence of Christ with the Church; for the Manhood, though distinguishable, is not to be detached from the

Person of Christ. Therefore he said, "Lo! I am with you always," and "Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them." But the distinction between the Person and the Manhood, so important in Christology, has a value also in the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ.

Let us, then, venture on the inference that the life or soul of this Body of Christ is the human Spirit of Christ, and that this inherent life of the Church is not to be confused with the further gifts of life received from the transcendent Spirit of God. We may draw this conclusion with the greater confidence because St. Paul himself points to it. "We have the mind of Christ," he says. The word is important. The mind is the soul or human spirit functioning as intellect. I am not disturbed by the fact that he does not connect this saying with his doctrine of the Body of Christ, and that it occurs in the opening section of the Epistle to the Corinthians, before he has definitely reached that doctrine; for he was already in rapid movement towards it, and the connexion of soul and body is sufficiently obvious. And who are "We"

in this case? The Apostle himself, no doubt, but definitely as Apostle within the Church, teaching and directing. He magnifies his office, but never at the expense of the Church. He is here speaking of the philosophy which he can teach among the "perfect," those who are no longer babes in Christ, but full grown Christians, and of their capacity for it. He and they, teacher and taught, have the Mind of Christ.

The context will repay attention. His philosophy is "the wisdom of God," concerned with "things which eye saw not and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man." Contrast this with what he says in the opening of the Epistle to the Romans about the natural ability of man to learn invisible things of God from the visible works of creation. There he is in close touch with the dominant Stoicism of his day, which made theology a department of physics. Here he is speaking of invisible things of God which are not so manifested, "but unto us God hath revealed them through the Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the depths of God." Just as a man has in him depths which none but himself

can explore, "even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." Why, then, can we know them? Because a power to do so has been expressly bestowed on us. "We have received, not the spirit of the world"—note this characteristically Stoic phrase, brought in without apparent relevance—"but the Spirit which issues from God." The truths thus learnt we can communicate to others in the Church, "sharing with spiritual men our criticism of spiritual things," [1] but to a merely animal man they are unintelligible foolishness. Finally the capacity for receiving this knowledge is explained: "We have the mind of Christ."

It is generally allowed that St. Paul had some familiarity with the Stoic philosophy. Being such as he was, he could hardly have lived at Tarsus without acquiring it. But he evidently found at Athens that he was no match for the philosophers of the sect on their own ground, quoting to them one of their own masters, and using terms of their immanent theology, which fill St. Luke's brief

[1] I venture on this rendering of *πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συνκρίνοντες*.

abstract of his speech in the Areopagus. It was a humbling experience, and when he passed on to Corinth "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling," he was resolved to lay aside this philosophy. "I thought it well," he says, "not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." This does not mean that there is no Christian philosophy. If he thought so in that moment of depression, he tells them four years later that he was mistaken, and briefly sketches the first principles of a system. They are three in number. He firmly puts aside the Stoic immanentism, with its limitation of God to the sensible world; he asserts the reality of knowledge transmitted to men from the transcendent God; and he claims for the Church the possession of a mind capable of receiving such knowledge. The system is esoteric. Those who have not the mind of Christ cannot appropriate the hidden wisdom of God, revealed through the Spirit.

One other inference I shall draw, and then I have done. If the Church has the Mind of Christ, we must expect the greatness and the limitations of that mind to be alike in evidence. The great-

ness lies, according to St. Paul, in the power of apprehending the deep things of God, specially revealed. The limitations are not as plainly asserted. One seems obvious. The Church does not know that of which the Lord declared himself to be ignorant, the day and hour of the end of this world. Others may be inferred. The Church seems to have no peculiar knowledge of the process of natural causation, and is therefore not specially qualified to pass judgment on questions of natural science; the Church probably has no peculiar information about historic events, about economic conditions or political expediency, and is not specially qualified to direct or control men's thoughts on such matters; the Church cannot, with the Mind of Christ, act as "judge or divider" where the Lord in person refused so to act. The Mind of Christ is in the Church, not to relieve our ordinary intelligence of labour and scrutiny, but to receive and declare the deep things of God revealed only by the Spirit of God, and so to judge in questions of truth and right which extend beyond the range of ordinary human wisdom.

## CHAPTER III

## THE MEMBERS OF THE BODY

"ALL the members have not the same office," says St. Paul to the Romans. A safer word, more exactly conforming to the original, would be "function." The word "office" has not ceased to be current in this sense, but it has acquired an additional meaning, more concrete, and proper to a formal organization. It is the *praxis* of the members that is in question. The Greek word did sometimes stand for a public office, but this use seems to have been rare, and it does not suit the context. The Apostle, as we have seen, is here dealing only with analogy, and speaks expressly of the members of the human body. These have their several functions in the natural economy of the whole body. "Even so we, a multitude, are

one body in Christ." [1] With great boldness he carries the physiological analogy further; the interdependence of the members of a living body is expressed in the paradoxical assertion that we are "severally members one of another." We should not press it to mean more. What St. Paul thought on this subject, we can see elsewhere, but here we must allow him to have written with some reserve to those strangers at Rome to whom he sends no personal greetings.[2] In these circumstances the limits of analogy must not be lightly exceeded.

He goes on to specify functions. With two exceptions they are such as might naturally be exercised by persons holding a recognized official position, but nothing resembling an official title is used. "Having gifts, differing according to the grace given to us; whether prophecy, according to the proportion of our faith; or ministration,

[1] In the sentence *οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν* it seems impossible to dissociate the phrase *οἱ πολλοὶ* entirely from its current political sense, or to rule out a faint reference to familiar philosophic discussions of "many in one." But it does not necessarily imply the existence of an organized community.

[2] The concluding chapter of the epistle as we have it is certainly a separate document of another date, whether addressed to Rome or elsewhere.

in our ministration ; or he that teaches, in his teaching ; or he that admonishes, in his admonition ; he that imparts, in simplicity ; he that leads,[1] in diligence ; he that succours, in cheerfulness." I have preserved the characteristically disjointed construction, to avoid the intrusion of anything not actually in the text. All these functions are gifts, *charismata*, and a comparison with other epistles shows that St. Paul meant by this word a direct operation of the transcendent Spirit of God ; there is a differentiation of such gifts, and therefore of function, but no systematized distribution is indicated. The prophet or the teacher is left on the same footing as the giver of alms ; the leader is not identified as a ruler, or even as the president of a society. Later in the epistle St. Paul speaks of himself in the most official terms, as the " minister of Jesus Christ," using the same word by which he has previously described the civil magistrate as a " minister of God," and makes the work of the Gospel a sacerdotal function.[2] But

[1] *Ὁ προϊστάμενος*, *infra*, p. 73.

[2] Rom. xv. 16. The critical words are *λειτουργὸν* and *ἱερουργοῦντα*. Compare xiii. 6, *λειτουργοὶ γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰσὶν*.

there is no trace of this in the passage which we have been considering.

Shall we infer that at Rome, whatever may have been the case elsewhere, there was no organized Christian community at the time when the epistle was written? There were Christian believers there, and they must have been in the habit of meeting together, for otherwise they could hardly have been addressed in common as "all in Rome that are beloved of God, called, saints." But were they merely a loose aggregation of individuals? The argument of the epistle is addressed to Jews; were those addressed no more than certain of the Synagogue in Rome who adhered to the "sect of the Nazarenes" without any separate organization?

The brief account of St. Paul's arrival in Rome, at the end of the Acts of the Apostles, may suggest that even then, four or five years after the epistle was written, affairs were on that footing. The Apostle and his companions were met by "the brethren" outside the city, but there is no appearance of any official reception. Compare with this the story of his last visit to Jerusalem: "The brethren received us gladly; and the day following

Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present." Both descriptions are from the Travel Document, and the difference speaks for itself. At Rome it is to the chiefs of the Synagogue that St. Paul reports himself.

There were Christians at Rome when the epistle was written, known and of good reputation. "Your faith is proclaimed," he tells them, "throughout the whole world." It was, no doubt, a courteous exaggeration, but not unfounded. They were known, at all events, in Corinth, where he was writing. Some years earlier he had there met Aquila, "lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome"; and Aquila was undoubtedly at once a Jew and a Christian believer. Suetonius records such an expulsion, saying that it was due to the turbulent behaviour of the Jews "impulsore Chresto," an explanation which has naturally been read as a confused memory of disputes in the Synagogue over a question which the Roman magistrates could not be expected to understand. It is possible that this dispersal had broken up a previously existing Christian Church,

not yet entirely detached from the Synagogue, but of that we have no evidence. If it were so, St. Paul may well have heard from Aquila, now at Ephesus, that some individuals had returned, and were holding to the faith in difficult circumstances. The tentmaker would have correspondents; if he had been at hand in Corinth, the Epistle to the Romans might have contained some personal greetings.

All this, however probable, is the merest conjecture, and must be left on that footing. Another question demands attention. Was the state of things, thus dimly descried at Rome, usual or normal elsewhere? Was the organization of the Church, indicated in the Acts of the Apostles and traceable in other epistles, a development of the Way, legitimate perhaps, but not fundamentally necessary? If the believers at Rome were still, after more than twenty years, no more than a loose aggregation of individuals, can we maintain the conclusion, already reached, that the Church is integral to the religion of the Gospel? Was the Remnant an afterthought, and was St. Paul the true founder of the Church?

We have to reckon with a conception, not indeed

new, but newly elaborated by Rudolph Sohm, according to which the Church is indeed the People of God's Kingdom, but not in the sense of an organized community ; it is embodied, indeed, but by a purely spiritual correlation of members, not by any kind of external incorporation ; it consists of all those, and those only, who by the operation of the Spirit have received the truth of the Gospel. In a word, it is the Invisible Church of Luther's distinction. Such, and such only, it was at the beginning. Some development of Christian institutions was inevitable, since men were thrown together in such sort that they could not fail to organize themselves in a social order ; little groups of Christ-worshippers, as in the case of the other cults which abounded at the time, were spontaneously formed here and there, conforming more or less to a common type ; it could not be avoided, but the emergence of these institutions was nevertheless a disaster, marring the pure spirituality of the religious movement, and to identify a federation of such groups with the true Church was nothing short of apostasy. The result was " Katholizismus."

It should be remembered that Sohm was much more jurist than theologian. His speculations were the result of a work, begun but never continued beyond one volume, on "Kirchenrecht," and it is not surprising that he found in the developed Canon Law elements which seem alien to the Gospel as first promulgated; Creighton also thought the later developments of the system injurious to religion. But the attempt to eliminate all such elements from "Urchristentum" will not bear investigation, and the conception of the Invisible Church in which he takes refuge is a product of disappointment with historic Christianity. On the other hand there is almost as much exaggeration in Harnack's rejoinder: "Probably never in the history of religion has a new society appeared with a more abundant and elaborate equipment. The formation of a legal code also, which began at once, exhibits even in its earliest stages the most complicated structure." [1] Can we steer a course between these extremes?

As always, St. Paul is our earliest witness.

[1] *The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries*, p. 20.

Over against the studied vagueness that we have found in the Epistle to the Romans we have to set other evidence. In the Epistle to the Galatians we find the Apostles unmistakably exercising authority, but no further organization is indicated; the other functions of service and control which are mentioned might be purely mutual. In writing to the Thessalonians St. Paul speaks with a note of command, and seems to include Silvanus and Timothy in his commission. "We had power to be burdensome," he says, "as apostles of Christ," and the context makes the meaning plain; they might have demanded maintenance, but refrained from doing so, and preferred to work for their living. Timothy is called "a minister of God," with implication of divine appointment. The relations of the faithful at Thessalonica are chiefly mutual; their duty is to "exhort one another and build each other up"; but they are charged to recognize some "who labour among you and are set over you in the Lord," and these they should "esteem exceeding highly in charity for their work's sake." Here is the word [1] which we have

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 12, προϊσταμένους. *Supra*, p. 67.

read in the Epistle to the Romans as signifying leadership in general, but it seems here to indicate some official standing.

This very slight evidence of organization, not extending with certainty beyond the Apostle and his personal coadjutors, is enlarged in the Epistles to the Corinthians. St. Paul has occasion, as with the Galatians, to vindicate his apostolate, to show that he is "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." It was an office that could be challenged. He exercises the office without hesitation: "I give charge, not I, but the Lord." There he speaks as messenger, but immediately afterwards it is, "To the rest say I, not the Lord," and there follows, "So I order in all the churches." He gives some instructions in writing, "and the rest I will order when I come." In case of need, he will even boast of "our authority which the Lord gave," and he hopes that when he comes he may not have to "deal sharply according to the authority which the Lord gave me for building up, and not for casting down." Yet it could be used, in passing and to a good end, even for casting down, as in the case of the terrific sentence on the incestuous

brother : " I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as though I were present, judged him that hath so wrought this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together and my spirit in the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." It is impossible to put the legitimate power of the apostolic ministry higher than that.

But not the apostolate only is now in question. He speaks of diversities of ministrations, and gives a list of functions like that which we have found in the Epistle to the Romans : wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracle, prophecy, spiritual discernment, tongues, interpretation ; " all these worketh the one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." This differentiation of function is not deduced, as in the Epistle to the Romans, from the apologue of the body and the members ; on the contrary, it leads up to that apologue. Then the apologue, as we have seen, broadens into metaphor. There follows another list, partly of functions, partly of persons endowed

with functions, which is based on the differentiation of members. "Ye are a Body of Christ, and members each in his part. And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then powers, then gifts of healing, helps, guidances, kinds of tongues." They are all *charismata*, gifts, and even the most abstract implies a recipient; guidance calls for a guide. Moreover, there is a negative as well as a positive differentiation. The gifts are not broadcast, for all or any to accept. As foot is not hand, and ear is not eye, so here. "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all powers? Do all possess gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?" Nor are all the gifts of equal value. "Desire earnestly the greater gifts," he continues. There is an ascending scale. Some of them, indeed, seem to have been more general than is here implied. He says later, "I would have you all speak with tongues, but rather that you should prophesy," and again, "You all have power to prophesy one by one." He adds significantly, "But let all be done with distinction [1]

[1] *Εὐσχημόνως*. I would illustrate the meaning of this word by *εὐσχημοσύνην* and *εὐσχήμονα* in xii. 23; also by reference

and in order" ; so that the exercise even of these most common functions was subject to regulation. Nor was the ordering of such things an internal affair of the community at Corinth. He demands with a touch of indignation, "Was it from you that the word of God went forth, or came it unto you alone?" There was a word of God touching these things and the like, a divine ordering to which they of Corinth must conform. There were rules which they must observe, "as in all the churches of the saints."

We are very far from the loose aggregation of individuals which the Epistle to the Romans may seem to countenance. "The Church of God which is at Corinth" appears to be an ordered community, likened to an articulate body with differentiated members, definitely under the control of a man bearing the title of Apostle, who lays down rules of conduct, moral or religious ; and the community, with the Apostle, sits in judgment on members who break those rules. We find also in the community tribunals dealing with the ordinary

to Mark, xv. 43, and Acts xiii. 50, where rank or social prestige is indicated.

business of life,[1] to which the members are expected to resort rather than to the civil magistrate. There is certainly some equipment, if not so abundant and elaborate as Harnack would have us suppose, and there is at least the beginning of a legal code. Then we may observe that this community is closely associated with other communities of the same kind, observing the same rules under the same control. Finally we observe that all who belong to the community, and so also those who belong to similar communities, are described metaphorically as members of Christ, and are said to have the mind of Christ; they belong therefore not to this community alone, but to a larger whole of which this forms a part, and the articulation here revealed will be found to run more or less continuously through the whole.

This we can affirm on the evidence, but about the details of the organization we are told hardly anything. It is not surprising; for the epistles were written to men familiar with the whole adminis-

[1] *Βιωτικὰ κριτήρια*, 1 Cor. vi. 4. Compare *μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς*, Luke xxi. 34.

tration, and the Apostle had occasion to mention only some faults in the working. In particular it may be doubted whether he mentions any title of an administrator, except his own title of Apostle. The "first—secondly—thirdly" of the list suggests that the Prophet and the Teacher are put on the same footing as the Apostle, and we shall find support for this interpretation in the Epistle to the Ephesians, but the apparent generality of the gift of prophecy is against it. A definite conclusion seems impossible.

The outstanding fact is that St. Paul regards all differentiation of function as the work of God. "God hath set some in the Church." This fits in accurately with the casual description of Timothy as a "minister of God." Whatever their standing may have been, these men were not officers of a society, created and appointed by the society; they were God's ministers, of God's appointment. The fact that St. Paul could without sense of incongruity substitute the term "minister of Christ" is significant only of the fulness of his Christology. It will be seen what agreement is here with the rapidly growing conviction that the apologue or

metaphor of the Body and the Members is more than metaphor, a figure of reality ; for the important differentiation of members in a human body is the work of God the Creator.

The position is summed up in the memorable saying, " Let a man reckon us officers under Christ, and stewards of God's mysteries." Both words have a definitely official sense, connected with public administration.[1] And who were to be so regarded by the Corinthian Christians ? The Apostle himself certainly, and probably his immediate helpers or delegates, such as Timothy and Sosthenes. So far we do not trace any others whom we can definitely put in the same class, or in a corresponding class ; the members of Christ have diverse functions, but only some of these can we identify as official.

Neither do we find any further differentiation when we pass to the later epistles in which the doctrine of the Body of Christ is developed. Functions are again enumerated, not with the same

[1] *Ὑπηρέτης*. Cf. Matt. v. 25, xxvi. 58 ; Mark xiv. 54, 65 ; Luke iv. 20 ; John vii. 32, xviii. 3, 12, 18, 22 ; Acts v. 22 ; and especially Acts xxvi. 16. *Οἰκονόμος*. More usually a domestic administrator, as in Luke xii. 42, xvi. 1 ; but cf. Rom. xvi. 23.

terms : " He gave some, apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers." A pastor is certainly a ruler, the title being familiar alike in Hebrew and in Greek poetry, but there is nothing to show what sort of rule is intended, or by whom it is exercised. The Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to the Colossians alike describe the relation of Christians to one another in terms of mutuality. Wives, indeed, are to be submissive to their husbands, children to their parents, and servants to their masters, but no other grades of honour or subjection are indicated. Archippus has a " ministry in the Lord " at Colossae, but its nature is not disclosed, and the word carries no implication of authority.

The other great epistle of the Roman captivity supplies what is here lacking. Was the Epistle to the Philippians earlier or later than those to the Churches of Asia ? I am inclined to agree with those who place it earlier, Lightfoot and Hort among them, not on the grounds of style and diction urged by them, which seem inconclusive, but rather because St. Paul is here still in the heat

of that conflict with Judaizers which has been allayed when he writes to the Ephesians; but they are not separated by any long interval. The inference seems to be that the peace which he celebrated so jubilantly was made during his imprisonment at Rome. Whether we have one epistle to Philippi, or a conflation of two, the position remains the same; if two, the conflict is mentioned in both. In any case, all the epistles of the group are nearly contemporaneous. Both to the Philippians and to Philemon St. Paul expresses a hope that he may be released to visit them once more, but to the latter he writes with much confidence, to the former with an equal expectation of immediate death. The only thing directly concerning us at present is the fact that he addresses the saints at Philippi "with the bishops and deacons." We retain the Greek words, in their English dress, because they are all but certainly formal titles of an official ministry.

We have found the word *diaconus* applied to Timothy as "God's minister," and we shall find it in the appendix to the Epistle to the Romans applied to Phoebe, who is a servant, not of God,

but "of the Church at Cenchreae." We have found *diaconia* attributed to Archippus, without being able to give it any specific meaning. Indeed both words, *episcopus* and *diaconus* are general terms of common speech, signifying respectively oversight and service, which acquired a specific meaning in the Christian Church. We hit upon the track of this specification in the Epistle to the Philippians, and we must pursue it.

We naturally turn to the Pastoral Epistles, not assuming their general authenticity as they stand, but confidently affirming their composition out of genuine Pauline materials. The letter to Titus belongs to the period of St. Paul's work in the Aegean and his voyages between Corinth and Ephesus. Already, here, the bishop is mentioned as God's steward, and his office seems to be identified with that of the "presbyters" whom Titus, as the Apostle's delegate, is to appoint in every city of Crete. The first to Timothy appears to be made up of various notes, one of which is dated about the same time, and it supposes Timothy left in charge at Ephesus. Of the rest, neither time nor place can be ascertained, but there is no ground

for detaching any of them from that period in general. There is a "trustworthy saying," quoted from an unknown source, "If a man aspires to an office of oversight, he desires honourable work." There is no reason for referring this to a treatise on the Christian episcopate; it sounds like a moral maxim of general and trite application; but St. Paul applies it specifically to "the bishop" who "takes care of a church of God," and stands to it as a father to his own household. Immediately afterwards he speaks of the qualities required in deacons, who are evidently officials, since "they must first be tested, and then serve as such." Here, again, "presbyters" are mentioned, and this word also is at once general and specific. In one place it means only the elder men of the community; "Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father; the younger men as brethren; the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters." Elsewhere we read: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching." Here they are officials with specified duties, and the "honour" referred to is official wages or

maintenance, for it is emphasized by a reference to the Old Testament which St. Paul used in the same connexion when writing to the Corinthians. The secondary evidence of the Acts affords corroboration. "Apostles and presbyters" confer and speak with authority at Jerusalem; on the occasion of his last visit, St. Paul "went in unto James, and all the presbyters were present." In neither case does the word seem to have the primary meaning of age. During their tour in upper Asia, Paul and Barnabas "appointed presbyters in every church." Quite casually, as familiar functionaries, "the presbyters of the church" are mentioned also in the Epistle of James. We need not recall the known practice of the Synagogue to account for the adoption of the title. It is common to all mankind, and the implication of age is everywhere as completely submerged as in the case of a Roman Senator and of an English Alderman.

If the First Epistle to Timothy were a single connected document, we should be almost compelled to recognize the episcopate and the presbyterate as distinct and separate offices, for they are there treated severally; but if it is made up

of various disconnected notes, as seems more probable, there is no such necessity; the two titles may have been used on different occasions for the same office. The apparent identification of the two in the charge to Titus will then stand. It is confirmed by a passage in the Acts, which has the more authority since it occurs in the Travel-Document. St. Paul sends for "the presbyters of the church" at Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, where he addresses them: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God, which he purchased with his own blood." He does not distinguish some of them as exercising this pastoral oversight; all appear to share it in common. The office is one, with two designations, which at most indicate two aspects of one ruling authority.

We find, then, officers bearing these titles in the Apostolic Church, so diffused, and so much taken for granted, that we can hardly doubt their generality. So far as we can see, they serve locally, and they are clearly subordinate to the apostles, or to those delegates whom an apostle commissions

to act in his place. There is, therefore, a graded ministry. Attempts have been made to distinguish the higher functions as *charismatic*—a word invented for the purpose—in the sense that they were exercised under the direct impulse of the Spirit, while the inferior and localized ministries issued in the ordinary way of human institutions from the corporate activities of the Church. The distinction breaks down in face of the comprehensive catalogue of functions which St. Paul furnishes on three several occasions. All functions alike are *charismata*. Ruling is one of them : if the apostles rule, so do the presbyters ; if these teach, so do those ; if Timothy is to do the work of an evangelist, so are the presbyters to labour in the word ; if healing is one of the gifts, James knows the presbyters as the ordinary dispensers of healing ; if deacons bear the most general title of ministry, that ministry is one of the " gifts differing according to the grace that was given to us." The different functions are all of one : " All these worketh the one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." Elsewhere the apostles and their helpers are God's stewards ; so also are bishops

in the charge to Titus. All differentiation in the members of Christ's Body is on the same footing. Does it seem strange that familiar designations of office are not mentioned in St. Paul's catalogues? But on all three occasions he was thinking of function in general, nor did he confine himself to office-bearers. On the contrary, while distinguishing the "greater gifts" he disclosed a "still more excellent way" which was common to all the members alike, the way of charity.

We need not look far to find that this charity is the very life of the Body of Christ and of the Members. The exercise of it is the normal evidence of life. "We know that we have passed from death into life," says St. John, "because we love the brethren; he that loveth not remaineth in death." The members have their various functions, but can exercise them only as they possess the general function of life. The greater gifts are therefore dependent on this common gift, and are not superior to it in value. They are not the less real in their distinctness, nor the less necessary; a living body is not an amorphous container of life, but is always articulate; yet no special func-

tion is dominant. It is a false physiology which seeks in one or other organ the seat of life. We must not attribute to any of the apostles a knowledge of human physiology sufficient to establish this principle ; they would know only the various conjectures current in their time. St. Paul was probably acquainted with the Stoic conception of the vital breath or spirit extending continuously throughout the body, a conception which would admirably illustrate his doctrine ; or he may have leaned to the other Stoic theory which placed the seat of this spirit within the breast. But he would allow no such location in the Body of Christ. His confused account of the relation of the Head to the Members, his identification of Christ now with the Head and now with the whole, is reduced to order in the thought of the vitality of Christ pervading and harmonizing every minute articulation of the Body. No member, no group of members, can dominate the rest. That is the eminently practical teaching of St. Peter's Epistle, conveyed in his exhortation to the Presbyters : " Tend as shepherds the flock of God which is with you, not by constraint but voluntarily, after the manner of

God . . . neither as lording it over those allotted to you, but making yourselves examples to the flock." It is an echo of what Peter himself had been taught: "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister, and whosoever would be first among you shall be a slave of all; for the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." Hence it is that the lowest title is applicable to the highest grade; "Christ hath been made," says St. Paul, "a *deacon* of the circumcision." Hence it is also that "ministry" is the general term for all office of dignity in the Church, and that after many divagations of ambition the proudest of prelates desires to be called *Servus servorum Dei.*

We have little information in the canonical books about the specific duties and powers of this Ministry. About the deacons, nothing; it is a mere conjecture, though supported by later developments, that they stood to the presbyters or bishops as Stephen and his fellows to the apostles at Jerusalem. About the presbyters or bishops we have the single reference of James to the anointing of the sick, a single reference to "the laying on of the

hands of the presbytery" for the conveyance of a *charisma* to Timothy, and general indications of pastoral rule with "labouring in the word and in teaching." Like the apostles, they are God's stewards. They may be the "spirituals" who are charged in the Epistle to the Galatians with the restoration of penitents; they would presumably exercise the stern discipline ordered by the Apostle at Corinth: "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves"; but a later reference to such punishment as inflicted "by the majority" suggests the concurrence of a general meeting of the Church.[1]

The titles of ministration which became permanent in the Church were presumably those belonging to the most definite organization, and the passage of Greek words into the Latin speech is good evidence of a settled polity. But for this we must wait until the end of the second century. In the interval we can trace the system so far presented to us, partly continuing, partly undergoing considerable change. The Seer of the Apocalypse, whoever he was, addresses the Churches

[1] See Note F, *The Christian Sacerdotium*, p. 237.

of Asia with all the authority of an apostle, but tells us nothing of their internal economy except the existence of an "Angel" or Messenger, unknown elsewhere. The Didachê, of uncertain date and provenance, knows "apostles and prophets" as itinerant ministers, respected but not altogether trusted, with "bishops and deacons" as local ministers also ranking as "prophets and teachers"; presbyters are not mentioned. Hermas, when the second century is well advanced, speaks broadly of "apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons," some of whom have fallen asleep but others are still living; the deacons minister in particular to widows and orphans, but so also do the bishops; elsewhere he mentions "the presbyters who preside over the Church." These are glimpses of a recognizable organization, but the *Shepherd* is too allegorical and fantastical a work to convey satisfactory information. Much more helpful is the formal epistle of the Church at Rome to the Church at Corinth, known as Clement's, though the name does not appear in it. Here the apostolate is described as definitely a thing of the past; the apostles in their day appointed bishops and deacons,

whom others have in like manner succeeded. The purport of the epistle is that these men must not be repudiated or removed from their office. Elsewhere the same is said of presbyters, who are probably to be identified with the bishops, though the point is not quite clear.

Early in the second century the Epistles of St. Ignatius present us with something new. The titles of bishop and presbyter are now sharply distinguished ; there is one bishop in each city, with presbyters who are to him " as the strings to a lyre," and deacons who are entirely subordinate. He may be comparatively young in years, like Damas of Magnesia, but they are not to hold him the less in reverence. The Church is to " do nothing without the bishop," and is to be "subject to the presbytery as to the apostles of Jesus Christ." Now that he himself is torn from his own Church in Syria, " Jesus Christ alone will be its bishop." A Church is to have " one eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, one cup for the oneness of his blood, and one altar, as there is one bishop with the presbytery and deacons." That is a valid eucharist which is under the control

of the bishop or of one commissioned by him ; and " where the bishop appears, there let the people be ; just as where Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church."

There is no possibility of misunderstanding this language. In the five Churches of Asia addressed by Ignatius, as in his own Church at Antioch, the organization described was in working order, and he treated it as a matter of course. One would say that it was general throughout the whole Church. But against this conclusion there are four things to be considered. (1) In the Epistle of Clement, some twenty years earlier than those of Ignatius, there is no trace of such an organization at Corinth. (2) In the *Shepherd* of Hermas, written some years after, it is equally ignored. (3) These two books are of Roman origin, and in his Epistle to the Romans Ignatius barely alludes to the monarchic episcopate as existing at Antioch. (4) Neither is it mentioned in the contemporaneous epistle addressed by Polycarp, himself Bishop of Smyrna in this new sense, to the Church at Philippi. It therefore seems probable that in the first quarter of the second

century the Ignatian episcopate, so to call it, was fully established in the Churches of Asia and eastwards, but that Churches west of the Aegean retained the older organization of a college of bishops or presbyters, indifferently so called. Accepting this explanation, we have to reckon with the fact that in the middle of the second century the Palestinian Hegesippus, travelling as far as Italy, found Churches everywhere, and notably at Corinth and Rome, showing a succession of single bishops from the time of the Apostles. The discrepancy may be explained, without any rejection even of doubtful evidence, on the very probable supposition that the episcopal college or presbytery always had a president, whose name was recorded. Such a president would not be all that the Ignatian bishop had become, but his position might have developed to that office, and might in retrospect be confused with it. Such a development could hardly be effected without friction, and the "strife about the name of the episcopate" to which Clement refers may have that significance. But the silence of Ignatius on the subject makes this doubtful. Another explanation is possible, and perhaps preferable.

I have called the Ignatian episcopate a new thing. But it was not without precedent. The position of James at Jerusalem seems to be exactly the same, and a tradition of some value gives him as successor his brother Symeon, who retired with his flock to Pella before the great siege, and ruled the Church there for many years. No other instance of the same kind is on record, but it is clear from St. Paul's own account of his doings that when he was residing for some time at any place, as for eighteen months at Corinth, and again for two years or more at Ephesus, he held much the same position ; Timothy also was left for a time at Ephesus with a similar charge, and other apostolic delegates are mentioned whose functions were probably assigned to Titus throughout the island of Crete. All these seem to have been temporary visitants of a kind surviving in the Prophets of the Didachê. The Angels of the Churches in the Apocalypse may have been such apostolic messengers. Suppose them to have been placed in charge more permanently, and the Ignatian Bishop emerges. The title presents no difficulty. It had been used so loosely, and its fundamental meaning was so

appropriate to their functions, that it may well have been appropriated to them by common consent, leaving the more ordinary style of "presbyter" to those who had formerly had a share in it. In that case, the Bishop is a continuing apostolic delegate. But by whom delegated? We have learnt nothing yet about the appointment of such bishops; but, as soon as we hear of it, we shall find them receiving mission from those—I borrow St. Paul's phrase about apostles—who were bishops before them. The apostolic office continues in commission; the title is dropped, perhaps out of modesty, but Bishops succeed the Apostles in the function of ruling.

Here are two ways of accounting for the emergence of the Ignatian episcopate, either of which seems to me satisfactory, the second more probable. I am unwilling to lean hard on the tradition reported by Irenaeus, according to which the new system was definitely established at Rome by the Apostles Peter and Paul; there would be nothing remarkable in the repetition there of what had been done with James at Jerusalem, but the silence of Clement and Hermas is hard to overcome. Indeed, Rome

and Alexandria, two Churches which had much in common, make the most difficulty for the hypothesis of apostolic delegation. At Alexandria there are traces of a presbytery with an elected president, and something of the same kind fits in with the earlier information that we have about Rome. Shall we say that two converging streams produced the Ignatian episcopate? The system of apostolic delegation, and the system of presbytery with a president, might equally tend to a monarchic pastorate, and we may suppose the results assimilated.

Abandoning conjecture, we find at the end of the second century a ministry in the Church established beyond question after the fashion depicted by St. Ignatius, the ministry of bishop, presbyters, and deacons. It has become so normal that the titles have lost their fluidity, are used as technical terms, and therefore pass without translation into the Latin language. Thence they have passed on, with phonetic variations, to the languages of modern Europe. I have so far used the Greco-Latin form *presbyter*, conscious of a certain pedantry in doing so, for the avoidance of a secondary sense

which the English equivalent has acquired ;[1] but having reached this point, inverting Milton's epigram and remembering that *priest* is but *presbyter* writ small, I shall adopt the more natural term, and speak of bishop, priest, and deacon. The hierarchy so determined, with variable additions of subordinate ministers, has continued in existence, unchallenged until the sixteenth century, subject since then to a definite challenge. But its organization has been by no means uniform, and the variations must not be neglected, since they throw a light on its essential character, which may illuminate urgent questions of to-day. I shall not here deal with theological questions of its competency and particular functions, but only with its pastoral quality in general as exhibited in history.

We see it first established in the cities of Asia and the East. For a long time there is no evidence of any provision made for rural districts, but eventually we hear of *chorepiscopi* in these regions, whose standing is uncertain until they are made definitely subordinate to the Bishop of a neighbouring city. For the Church in the city, and

[1] See Note F, *The Christian Sacerdotium*, p. 237.

perhaps for the surrounding country, the Bishop is conspicuously the centre of unity. Indeed he seems to be appointed expressly for this function, upon which Ignatius is perpetually insisting. For this reason it is made a strict rule that there shall be only one bishop in each city, however large the flock which he is to administer. Even if he is only the chief of a college of priests equal in all other respects, as possibly at Rome and Alexandria, he is still singular in this function. There is evidence of continual correspondence by letter between the bishops, and their mutual recognition seems to be the one external bond of union for the whole Church. Christians passing from one region to another are provided by their bishop with letters commendatory to those under whose pastoral care they shall come. This applies also to priests, but their transference seems to be rare, and for a long time there is no trace of the translation of a bishop from one Church to another.

The warning of St. Paul about the inevitability of sects and divisions is abundantly justified. Sometimes these produce a definite separation from the hierarchy, or perhaps an attempt to set up a rival

organization. The only serious incident of the kind recorded in the first two centuries is the trouble at Corinth which was the occasion of St. Clement's Epistle, but there are obscure indications of similar dissidence elsewhere, and the urgency of Ignatius implies at least a consciousness of the danger. That, he says, which lacks bishop, priests and deacons, "is not called a Church." It is thought, however, by Zahn and others that he is not contemplating a separated organization, but a meeting for worship without the knowledge and consent of the bishop. That may be, but such a meeting would inevitably assume the style of an *ecclesia*, and therefore, with Lightfoot, we make the words mean that it is not entitled to the name.

The existence, possible or actual, of such separated churches seems to be responsible for a phrase which first appears in the account of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, sent by the Church at Smyrna to neighbouring churches. He is here styled "Bishop of the Catholic Church which is in Smyrna," a curious expression which seems to confuse the universal and the particular. I take it to mean that he is the bishop recognized by the Church

at large, so that his flock partakes of the attribute of catholicity, and is distinguished as catholic from any other separated congregation not so recognized. It may be observed that in cities where several places of worship were required for the multitude of the faithful, that one in which the Bishop usually had his seat of presidence was known as the *catholica*, a use of the word which survived at least until the fourth century, and is found in the writings of St. Augustine.

This scheme of things is copiously illustrated in the middle of the third century by the collected correspondence of St. Cyprian and his treatise on the Unity of the Church. What is peculiar to him is an exaggerated insistence on the absolute equality of all bishops, whose mutual intercourse is the *gluten* which holds the whole Church together. They were numerous in his own region of Africa and Numidia, where bishops were established not only in considerable cities, but also in the smallest country towns, and on one occasion he bitterly resents the assumption that an appeal might be made from the judgment of some of their number to the great Church of Rome. He goes so far as

to say that bishops are appointed by Christ, as were the original apostles to whose place they have succeeded, and that by Christ alone they can be judged. His theory was sorely tried by a schism at Rome, where Novatian was set up as bishop in rivalry with Cornelius, for it had to be decided which was the rightful claimant ; Cyprian, with other African bishops, decided after investigation in favour of Cornelius, and then advised others that to communicate with Cornelius was to be in communion with the Catholic Church, to communicate with Novatian was to be schismatic ; but this clearly involved the judgment of one bishop by others. His conception of schism must be examined elsewhere ; here the case is mentioned as exposing the weakness of his episcopal theory. But while obstinately maintaining an indefensible position, he prepared the supply of what it lacked by assiduously promoting the assembly of bishops in council. If one bishop could not judge another, a large group of bishops acting together might have that power ; and shortly after his death a Council of eastern bishops succeeded in deposing Paul of Samosata, the occupant of the principal see of the East at

Antioch. From this beginning springs the regular system of Councils, provincial, general, and ecumenical, with the corollary of Metropolitans and Patriarchs. It is new as a matter of organization, but implies no addition of a new authority, being only a way of applying the original authority of the apostolate and the universal episcopate.[1]

A development of the presbyterate also must be noted. We see it first as a college. The delegate of the bishop, presiding at the eucharist according to the Ignatian scheme, would presumably be drawn from its ranks, but of this there is no evidence. Cyprian, in retreat from Carthage during persecution, commissions either priests or deacons to act for him in important matters. We learn also from his correspondence that at Rome, when for eighteen months after the martyrdom of Fabian it is found impossible to create a successor, the priests of the city take charge and administer the Church ; but they reserve some matters of importance until the advent of a new bishop. The seeds of the Novatianist schism were sown during this interregnum. Novatian was the correspondent of the presbyteral

[1] See Note G, *The Papacy*, p. 239.

college, perhaps its chief, and he was afterwards accused of resenting the promotion of Cornelius over his head. There seems to be no room for the independent action of any priest. This comes later. At a date and in circumstances indetermined, we find priests stationed in rural places with the title of *parochus*, a term borrowed from the civil administration, in which the *parochus* was an imperial purveyor. The chapel in which such a priest ministered, and eventually the district which he served, became his *parochia*, whence our *parish*, a word inextricably confused with *paroecia*, which meant rather what we mean by a diocese. This parochial system was afterwards brought into the cities, where other places of worship in addition to the *catholica* were needed. In the sixth century the legislation of Justinian secured to the founder of a parochial church and to his descendants, under the title of *patronus*, the right of appointing the parish priest, subject to confirmation by the bishop on whom he depended. Thus the clergy of a diocese consisted of those *in matrice*, at the mother-church or cathedral where the bishop's seat was established, with the parish priests of the

surrounding districts, and the presbyteral college was to that extent dissolved.

The deacons are even more closely attached to the bishop than the priests, in the character of personal attendants, their liturgical functions springing from this attendance. They are his almoners, to some extent his secretaries, and custodians of the Church's goods. The seven deacons at Rome become great personages, overshadowing, as St. Jerome complained, the more numerous priests. For a considerable period the bishop is usually chosen from their number. A far-off result of this relation is the modern office of archdeacon. In course of time the diaconate sinks in importance, and becomes little more than a vestibule to the priesthood.

So far I have had in view the Mediterranean lands in which the Catholic Church, eastern and western, was developed on the lines indicated. North of the Alps we come upon a different scene. In the middle of the second century there appears to be only one bishop in Gaul, Pothinus of Lugdunum, to whom Irenaeus succeeds. Other Churches are soon established, but they are never

as numerous as in Asia, Africa and Italy. This state of things becomes permanent, with a wide range of variation, in countries farther north. In the eighth century St. Boniface, established at Mainz, had a roving mission along the Rhine from the Alps to the sea. Even in the sixteenth century the diocese of Cologne extended more than two hundred miles, and that of York, Lincoln or Exeter, was not much smaller. It is evident that episcopacy meant here something very different from the scheme which we have been considering. On the other hand it is interesting to observe that the bishop of such a diocese, which he could administer only by periodical visitation with the help of many delegates, was in the scope of his labours nearer to the original apostles than to their successors in southern lands.

Yet another scene opens in Ireland, where for some centuries bishops existed in a strangely subordinate position, subject to the abbots of great monasteries, and performing only such liturgical functions as were reserved to their order. It is an aberration which does not deserve more than a passing mention.

Turning from the hierarchy to the other members of the Body of Christ, we note that they have their proper standing by no favour of the hierarchy. Their rights are not privileges that can be arbitrarily withheld. Those whom St. Cyprian calls the *plebs* are essential to the integrity of the Church. If he says that "the bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop," he says in the same breath that the church consists of "the *plebs* united to the priest and the flock adhering to its pastor." He associates them with himself in regulating the restoration of those who have apostatized in persecution: "When the Lord has given peace to the church," he writes to the *plebs* at Carthage, "every case shall be examined before you as judges." [1] Their suffrages are required for the election of a bishop; indeed "the chief power of choosing worthy priests and of rejecting the unworthy is lodged with them." [2] Nowhere else can be found anything quite as explicit on this head, but there is no ground for supposing that Cyprian

[1] "Praesentibus et iudicantibus vobis." Ep. xvii. 1.

[2] "Quando ipsa [plebs] maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes vel indignos recusandi." Ep. lxvii. 3.

goes beyond the general practice of his day. Against these rights of the laity is to be set a strict obligation of obedience, and a liability to penitential discipline for certain narrowly defined offences; there is also a peremptory suspension or excommunication of the recalcitrant. Every member of the Church carries with him all the rights of membership wherever he goes, if he is provided with letters of commendation from his own bishop, but it is held highly improper for one bishop to rehabilitate either a layman or a clerk who has been excommunicated by his own pastor.

In the course of time the rights and duties of the laity are considerably modified. The right of communion is enlarged. When Christians cease to be a people apart, and whole populations are gathered into the Church, the practice of commendation ceases, and everyone presenting himself as a Christian is received as such, unless his character is expressly challenged. Such is the practice almost everywhere in the Church to-day, as defined in the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1920: "The priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to

any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table, unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful." It should perhaps be added that such a person is presumed to be baptized, unless there is evidence to the contrary, and the same holds good for the ministry of ecclesiastical sepulture, but for certain other purposes evidence of status may be required.

I make only the most general statements here, not being concerned with minor variations of practice, and with equal generality I must note changes of discipline. The transference of immediate pastoral care from the bishop to the parish priest had important consequences. The ministry of public penance, with the exercise of the power of excommunication, has been reserved to the bishop or his special officers ; it has been gravely abused, becoming rather a matter of ecclesiastical police than of the cure of souls, and by reaction from such abuse tends to obsolescence ; the personal discipline of souls has passed to the priesthood, to be exercised at most in the way of private confession and absolution. The use of the active

powers of the laity, on which St. Cyprian laid so much stress, died out as Christianity became diffused, or was usurped by Princes and Civil Governments; for many centuries there has been a tendency to treat the ordinary layman as a very passive member of the Body of Christ; a result of this was the well-known letter in which Monsignor Talbot wrote to Manning: "What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain. These matters they understand, but to meddle with ecclesiastical matters they have no right at all."

This brief and inadequate survey will provide the answer to a question persistently asked. Is the episcopate a necessary organ of the Body of Christ? Is it of the *esse*, or only of the *bene esse*, of the Church? If it be a question of the episcopate as known to us, the answer is obvious. Diocesan episcopacy cannot be necessary, for the Church was ordered in the first instance without it. If it be asked whether a particular Church can exist without a bishop as pastor, the answer must be affirmative; otherwise the Roman Church would have ceased to exist when for eighteen months no successor to Fabian could be found, and every

Church to-day would cease to exist during the vacancy of the see. The question may be hypothetic. If Decius or Diocletian had succeeded in what seems to have been their object, the removal of all bishops, would the Catholic Church have ceased to exist? The answer may be that the providence of God would either prevent such a consummation or supply the crippled Church with what it needed. Sir Thomas More put a narrower hypothesis: describing the conversion and baptism of certain Utopians, he asked whether such a nascent Church, cut off from all communication with the rest of Christendom, could in any way obtain the ministry of true pastors; but he prudently avoided the responsibility of answering. There is a more practical question. If a particular Church, or group of Churches, resolve to have no more bishops, will it cease to be a part of the Universal Church? It does not seem to be so. Baptized believers in the communities affected will not cease to be members of Christ's Body, and their deprivation of a pastor is no more than might be effected by death. The usual practice of those who hold the episcopate necessary has been, not to

treat such derelict Churches as defunct, but to provide them as soon as possible with new bishops. I pass by, for the present, the question whether in these cases the apostolic ministry can be maintained by a presbyteral college, assumed in the absence of a bishop to recover its primitive functions, for priests and bishops alike may be lacking. To raise the question as broadly as possible we must ask whether a particular Church can exist without the apostolic ministry. I am disposed to answer as broadly that the members of Christ's Body are individual believers, that the Body must be articulated with diversity of function, that the apostolic ministry exists in divers forms as one function, but that tracts of the Body may conceivably exist showing no trace of that specific articulation.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE CRITERION OF AUTHENTIC MINISTRY

I TAKE it as settled that the sacred ministry is an important element in the articulation of the Church which is Christ's Body. It is therefore of some importance to know the persons to whom it has been entrusted. What are their qualifications, and how shall they be recognized?

A preliminary question must first be considered. Has the ministry been created by the Church? Human beings have a natural capacity for social organization, and indeed a compelling need of it; thrown together, in however fortuitous a way, they produce some kind of order, some sort of government, and provide of themselves the officers needed for the work of administration. Did the Christian Church in this way produce the sacred ministry? It need not be the less sacred on that

account, for if the Church be holy its natural fruits will partake of that holiness.

Such an origin is postulated in some quarters. Even if the Apostles were chosen and commissioned by the Lord himself to inaugurate the Church, it does not necessarily follow that they had any successors to whom the commission was transmitted ; they may have exhausted their powers in laying the foundation. One function ascribed to them bears out that supposition. In the Acts of the Apostles Peter is represented as saying that into the place of the traitor Judas another must be chosen to become a witness of the Resurrection. Two men are found duly qualified ; one of them is divinely indicated by lot, and is thereupon " numbered with the eleven apostles." The special function of an apostle, therefore, appears to be that of bearing witness to the fact of Christ's resurrection, and it is obvious that men of another generation could not give the same kind of testimony ; therefore the apostolate was a temporary function, without either need or possibility of permanence. Having delivered their witness, and seen the Church founded thereon, the apostles would pass away ;

in so far as they may have taken part in the organizing of the Church and of the sacred ministry, they would do this only as conspicuous members of the community, and not in their apostolic capacity.

The materials for an answer to this supposition are to be found in the preceding chapters. St. Paul evidently knew nothing of the kind. He was himself an apostle, not a whit behind those that were before him, but he was not a witness of the Resurrection such as Peter had demanded; he had seen the risen Lord, but not as the eleven and many more had seen. He was an apostle "not from men, neither through man," not by any kind of social appointment, but with a direct mission from God through Jesus Christ. He was the minister, not of the Church, but of God, a dispenser of divine mysteries. He was not peculiar in this; others shared his ministry, servants of God. Moreover, this ministry was not created by the Church, but was a gift to the Church, given by God: "He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting

of the saints unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the Body of Christ."

An objection may be raised. According to St. Paul, Caesar was equally God's minister. "The powers that be are ordained of God," and at the head of the powers that then were sat Claudius or Nero. How were they ordained of God? Only one answer is possible. It was by the natural working of human society, under God's ruling providence. Why should the powers of the Church be otherwise ordained? All functions of the members of Christ are *charismata*, gifts of the Spirit, and what is this but the indwelling Spirit of Christ, the Soul that animates the living Body of Christ? As the life of humanity is to State or Empire, so is the life of Christ to the Church; the Christ-spirit assigns various functions to the members of the Body, "dividing to every man severally as he will." The Church therefore has created the Ministry, and can vary it.

Again, I appeal from such speculations to the knowledge of St. Paul. The one Spirit that goes with the one Body, the Soul of the Church, is indeed the human Spirit, the Mind of Christ

as God incarnate ; but, in spite of a verbal confusion which he had not completely straightened out, he makes it plain that the Giver of the *charismata* is to be otherwise distinguished ; renouncing the Stoic immanentism, he says that we have received "not the Spirit of the World but the Spirit that is from God," the transcendent Spirit ; and it is this Spirit, sent from the ascended Lord, that "gave gifts unto men," giving to some men severally the functions of the sacred ministry. This being established, we see that the gift of the apostolate must be referred to the illapse of the Spirit at Pentecost, not to the original choosing and sending of them by the Lord Jesus in person. He chose them to be "endued with power from on high," but they were to wait for it ; they received it at Pentecost. The Church did not create the apostolic ministry ; it would be nearer the mark, though still not entirely accurate, to say that at Pentecost the Church and the Ministry were simultaneously created. St. Paul would prefer to say that all holy functions were then actually or potentially bestowed on the Church.

Nevertheless, the ordering of these functions in

detail was left to the Church possessing the Mind of Christ. We may properly say that the Apostles, as pastors of the Church, created the presbyterate and the diaconate by devolving on others some of the powers which they had received. Yet this also was done by direction of the Spirit. Even when dealing with a matter certainly not more important, "the apostles and the presbyters, with the whole Church," gathered at Jerusalem, did not hesitate to say, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." The choice of particular persons to serve in the sacred ministry was a more ordinary function of the Church, but it was still true that "God set them in the Church," and we can understand this only as meaning that the divine action was mediated by the Church.

In the Acts of the Apostles, and in the apostolic writings generally, there are casual references to this appointment of persons to the ministry, from which we may gather in some measure how they would be recognized as authentically appointed. There is no explicit statement on the subject, for the facts would be well known to those whom the writers were addressing. They wrote for their

contemporaries, not for the information of posterity. What information is given can be rapidly gathered up. A perfectly colourless word [1] is used of the appointments made by Paul and Barnabas in the cities of southern Galatia. In the appointment of the Seven the Apostles, " when they had prayed, laid their hands on them." A similar rite in the " separation " of Barnabas and Saul at Antioch can hardly have the same significance, for they were already engaged in the apostolic ministry ; but we return to it when St. Paul writes to Timothy of " the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," and again of " the gift of God which is in thee through the laying on of my hands." The prophecy is probably to be identified with the prayer spoken of in the Acts, a prayer made in the conscious power of the Spirit, and the Apostle seems to have associated the presbytery of some local Church with himself in the act. It is a ritual act done with some publicity, an outward sign designating the recipient of a spiritual *charisma*. To

[1] *Χειροτονεῖν*, not to be confused with *χειροθετεῖν*, *to impose hands*, which is not used in the canonical books.

avoid a verbal anachronism we had better not call it a sacrament, but it can hardly be doubted that St. Paul would regard it as one of the mysteries of God which he had to administer. He and the presbytery publicly incorporate the young recruit in the sacred ministry which they exercise. The inference is that a commission is transmitted by those who already have it to one who has it not. The same ritual act was used for other purposes; it was known in Jewish practice for this purpose, and would recall the appointment of Joshua to be the successor of Moses. One thing more may be noted. Titus, the apostolic delegate in Crete, was to "appoint presbyters in every city." Only in the case of the Seven is anything like election by the general community mentioned, but nothing can be argued from silence about it elsewhere; it was probably the usual procedure. This exhausts the evidence from the apostolic writings. Just so much is indicated also in the Epistle of Clement. Beyond this nothing can be ascertained from extant documents of the first century. What is so ascertained may be safely taken as showing the general practice.

But there is one important exception. St. Paul declared emphatically to the Galatians that he himself was an apostle "not from men, neither through man."[1] His meaning is clear; he did not receive his commission either directly from other men who had it before him, or mediately through the ministration of any man. He had it by direct divine appointment. How, then, was he incorporated into the ministry of the Twelve, of those who, as he puts it, were apostles before him? His answer is unmistakable. He was at once put in a place of equality with them, sharing all the spiritual gifts bestowed on them, "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles"; and his credentials were found, like theirs, in the possession of conspicuous gifts of the Holy Spirit. At first he held rather aloof from them, and perhaps they from him; but afterwards we find him going to Jerusalem, and allowing them to examine his credentials. He describes the interview himself, with laboured parentheses which suggest a reluct-

[1] *Οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου.* The second preposition may be compared with that in 2 Tim. i. 6, *διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου.*

ance to tell the story at all : " I went up by revelation, and laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those of importance, to see whether I run or had been running a vain course. . . . But from these men of seeming importance—what they really were does not concern me ; God does not accept the person of men—these men of importance, I say, added nothing to me, but on the contrary, seeing that I have been charged with the Gospel of the uncircumcised as Peter with that of the circumcision . . . and recognizing the grace given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reckoned columns, gave their right hands to me and to Barnabas, hands of communion."

This interview, so carefully reported, seems to indicate a principle. It is a function of the established authorities of the Church to investigate any extraordinary case in which a man claims possession of the grace of sacred ministry. We can hardly imagine St. Paul submitting to such investigation if it had not been legitimate and necessary ; and if it was right in the case of him who had received that grace not from men nor by the

ministry of man, *a fortiori* in the more normal case of one who claims to have received it through human agency will the same principle apply.

And what was the effect of this recognition? It did not make Paul what he had not been before. The three elder Apostles added nothing to him, he emphatically asserts. He was already an Apostle, equally with them. But something was changed. Hitherto his apostolic mission had been disputed; henceforth it was acknowledged throughout the whole Church. The effect was not, indeed, immediate, for he was still to be challenged by factions at Corinth; but they were mere factions. It may seem strange that he did not reply to their cavils by a reference to what had been done at Jerusalem; the faction that called itself Petrine could hardly have resisted that argument. He would not use it. He still relied upon his original apostolic mission. He maintained his cause exactly as if nothing of the kind had happened. And if it had not? It is impossible to avoid the hypothetic question. What if the elder Apostles had refused him recognition? Several possibilities present themselves, all fraught with disaster. He could

be accommodating on occasion. He might conceivably have consented to receive imposition of hands, instead of the right hand of equal communion. But then his original testimony would have been weakened, and the loss would be incalculable. Deriving, or appearing to derive, his authority from those who were Apostles before him, he would be more or less tied to their methods, and what he boldly called his own gospel would be submerged, or at least brought down to a subordinate position. On the other hand, he might have continued, patiently or impatiently, in the way marked out for him, until the other Apostles were come to a better mind. But then the Church would have been divided ; many of his own followers would probably have fallen away from him ; Pauline Christianity might have become a dwindling sect, and again the loss would be incalculable. Or perhaps it might have flourished in opposition to the Twelve ; then no united and universal Church could have emerged. There is a third possibility : Pauline Christianity might have triumphed, driving the tradition of the elder Apostles into obscurity and oblivion. Then it would have been severed

from intimate connexion with the beginnings of the Gospel, from Judaic origins and from Galilean memories ; the human Christ might have become remote and insignificant.

From all these perils the Church was saved by the guidance of the Holy Ghost. The act of recognition at Jerusalem preserved in its integrity the special mission of St. Paul, and at the same time established the authority of the elder Apostles. With this second effect we are now concerned. It supplies a principle which can be applied to later events. The old must verify the new.

At this point we are left by the records of the first century, and a long time elapses before we have any further evidence. St. Ignatius, who has so much to say about bishops, priests and deacons in their working order, does not help us here, for he says nothing about the mode of their appointment. For him, as for others, this was evidently too familiar a subject, too generally understood, to come into discussion. In the Didachê, and in the ancient documents now usually called " Church Orders," the practice of the apostolic Church emerges with additional detail, but the extant texts of these books are

of uncertain age, and the first definitely dated evidence available is found in the writings of St. Cyprian.

Cyprian speaks but casually of the ordination of priests and deacons, as also of inferior ministers ; it is always the work of a bishop, but there is no indication of the ritual used. On the other hand, he has much to say in detail about the promotion of a bishop. He insists, almost in the manner of St. Paul, that a bishop is created by God, but it is through the mediation of the Church. If it is not " from men," it is certainly " through man." He thus weakens the idea of transmission, which afterwards became dominant, but he does not diminish the importance of human agency. His account of the promotion of a bishop involves election by the clergy and the faithful, but this becomes effective only through co-optation by existing bishops. He once mentions imposition of hands in this connexion. It is possible that his language is sometimes coloured by familiarity with the inauguration of a Roman magistrate ; but he says nothing of real effect which is not adumbrated in the apostolic writings. So we come to the settled practice of the Catholic Church.

But again there is one exception to be noted. In some of the "Church Orders" there is a curious rule about Confessors. Mr. Horner's translation of the Saidic text is as follows :—

> The confessor then, if he has been in chains for the name of the Lord, they shall not lay hand upon him for a ministry (diakonia) or presbyterate : for he has the honour of the presbyterate by his confession. But if he is to be ordained bishop, then hand shall be laid upon him.[1]

It should be observed that a later rule in the same text says :—

> The confessor is not ordained ; for this thing belongs to his resolution and his endurance. For he is worthy of great honour, as having confessed the name of God and his Son before kings and the heathen. But should there be need to make him bishop or presbyter or deacon, let him be ordained. If when he has not been ordained a confessor should seize for himself the dignity on account of his confession, let him be deposed.[2]

Other texts put the privilege on this footing in both places. The Confessor does not automatically become a presbyter without ordination, but he has a special right to be ordained.

[1] *Statutes of the Apostles*, p. 308. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 345.

These documents do not come originally from obscure sources. They can be traced back with tolerable certainty to the great Churches of Rome and Alexandria in the third century. Yet St. Cyprian, who had much trouble with the ambition of the confessors, does not mention this privilege, and it was probably therefore unknown in Africa. The evidence points to a recognition of it for a time by certain Churches, which afterwards toned it down to something much less definite. If that be so, we find the authorities of these Churches acting in a measure exactly as the Apostles at Jerusalem acted in the case of St. Paul.

The importance of this obscure episode lies in the continued suggestion that the Church has great power in the matter, and much liberty ; that normal ordination is not the only possible way of access to the sacred ministry ; and that recognition by the Church is the only criterion of a ministry authentically obtained. It may be noted that joint action by the whole Church is not necessary. As St. Paul was sufficiently recognized, not by the whole apostolate, but by those three columns of stability, James, Peter and John, so the Confessors

of the third century were for a time effectively recognized as presbyters, not by the whole of the Catholic Church, but by certain particular Churches.

We are now come to the settled practice of the Church. None but a bishop ordains. Obscure suggestions of variation from this rule, which teased St. Jerome, have not stood the test of historic criticism. But will any Bishop suffice? According to St. Cyprian, ordination by a heretical or schismatic bishop was absolutely null, and he seems to speak the general mind of the Church in his day. Seventy years later the Council of Nicaea perhaps made an exception in favour of the Novatianists. Fifty years later again we find Optatus treating Donatist ordination as valid. Augustine followed him with an argument which extends broadly to all heretics. Seven centuries and more had to elapse before the new principle was definitely established, mainly by the influence of St. Peter Damian, for the whole Western Church. The Eastern Churches have never accepted it, though they make no difficulty about an "economic" recognition of schismatical ordinations. The Lambeth Conference of 1920

went back upon it in refusing to recognize orders conferred by *episcopi vagi*. Here again we have the authorities of particular Churches recognizing and validating a ministry which had been doubtful, or even rejected.

Ordination by a bishop or bishops follows a normal course. There are two elements : imposition of hands, and a prayer relative to the act. Scholastic theologians of a later age, with an eye fixed rather askew on Aristotle, will call these the *matter* and *form* of ordination, and there is nothing to be gained by the abandonment of these convenient terms.

A third time there is an exception. In the Church Orders to which I have referred there are detailed descriptions of the ordination of a bishop after another fashion. Attendant deacons hold the Book of the Gospels over his head while the officiating bishop says the prayer of consecration, and there is no mention of the imposition of hands.[1] This peculiar ceremony is not found in the oldest text of the series, Hauler's Verona Fragment ; it survives in the latest, the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions. There are grounds for con-

[1] Horner, *ut supra*, pp. 198, 274, 341.

necting it specially with the two great Churches of Rome and Alexandria, where at one time the Pope himself seems to have been consecrated with the Gospels, all other bishops with imposition of hands.[1] To this day in the Coptic Church the Gospels are so used only at the consecration of the Patriarch, but in conjunction with imposition of hands. Needless to say, the two ceremonies are amalgamated in the modern Roman Pontifical, as also in all Eastern rites except the Coptic order for the consecration of a bishop other than the Patriarch. Writing on this subject many years ago, with less information than is now available, I ventured to suggest that the chiefs of those two great Churches, being unwilling to receive imposition of hands from bishops who were to be their subordinates, substituted the use of the Gospel Book as representing the immediate authority of the Lord Christ. The enthronement of the Book at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon illustrates the sentiment.[2] I had the advantage of discussing this hypothesis with Duchesne, who was inclined to look on it with favour.

[1] Mabillon, *Ordo* ix. [2] *Revue Anglo-romaine*, iii. 193.

If I am right, we have here another indication of the power of a particular Church to determine, and to vary, the conditions of ordination. It is of interest as bearing on the opinion of certain theologians that in the Western Church the *porrectio instrumentorum* has been substituted for the imposition of hands as the *matter* of presbyteral ordination. Benedict XIV might ask with reason, where and when, in what Council, or by what Pontiff, the change was made,[1] but that it could be made is a tenable proposition.

In the *form* of ordination there has been much more variety. Here, again, the only criterion of authenticity is recognition by the Church, the evidence of which is actual use, past or present. How can it be applied? Some thirty years ago I was working on this subject with the Abbé Boudinhon and Mgr. Gasparri, now Cardinal Secretary of State, both being at that time professors in the Institut Catholique at Paris. Their method was exact. They collected all recognized forms actually known to them, eight in number, and eliminated from each what was peculiar to it,

[1] *De Synod. Dioec.*, 8, 10, 10.

or was found only in some others as well ; the residue common to all, they argued, was obviously sufficient, and nothing more could be required for validity. I agreed, but offered two criticisms : (1) since each of these forms had been introduced by the authority of a particular Church, the same authority was competent to introduce a new form ; and (2) their argument gave a positive result, but could not support a negative conclusion, for there may have been other recognized forms, not now extant, which lacked something included in all that are at present known. My second criticism was soon verified, for I was able to show that in the " Canons of Hippolytus " the form for the ordination of a deacon did show such a lack. M. Boudinhon promptly modified his residue. Father Brandi, in the *Civiltà Cattolica* poked fun at us both, not without reason, for arguing so confidently on the basis of a Latin translation made by a German from an Arabic version of a Greek original, and further pointed out that one word in it might not improbably represent the element supposed to be lacking. I accepted the castigation ; but nevertheless the incident illus-

trates the precariousness of a negative conclusion drawn from such premisses. Not long afterwards the discovery of the "pontifical" of Sarapion of Thmuis imposed a much more drastic revision of the residue.

I conclude that it is possible by this method to demonstrate theologically the sufficiency of a given form or matter of ordination, but impossible to prove its insufficiency. The last word remains always with the authorities of the Church, recognizing or refusing to recognize an ordination. But here also, if recognition is final—and the case of those confessors of the third century compels a doubt—a refusal of recognition must remain open to revision. For refusals have been cancelled. As disciplinary measures of control they must stand—while they stand; but history forbids us to regard them as settling anything about the ultimately necessary elements of ordination to the sacred ministry. Those elements are not known. They are God's secret. There is no need for knowledge. It is important for us to know that certain men bear indubitable marks of a steward of the divine mysteries, so that we may confidently

accept their ministrations; recognition of such marks, widely and continuously accorded by the Church, can give us the confidence needed. On the other hand, it is of small importance to know positively that other men are not so qualified; a *non constat* suffices to exclude them from the exercise of the sacred ministry. But such a negative judgment, however widely and continuously applied, is shown by history to be reversible.

By what authority precisely can recognition be accorded? The three Apostles at Jerusalem might speak effectively for the whole Church. When apostolic authority came to be widely diffused in the episcopate, local decisions would be more or less tentative, until confirmed by general acceptance, or countered by a large measure of repudiation. In the period of the great Councils there were diverse decisions on this, as on other disciplinary questions, and agreement was reached only by a long process of intercommunication. When perpendicular divisions of the Church interrupted communication, new decisions could be operative only in the severed parts. The decision of the Western Church in favour of schismatic ordina-

tion is an instance. So divided, the Church does not easily speak with one voice. In these circumstances the only rule of conduct is to accept the decision of the particular authority under which one lives. The papal authority, for example, is sufficient for all who bow to the larger claims of the Papacy, but for none else.

New decisions, therefore, must remain more or less tentative. Recognition of the abnormal is in the highest degree precarious ; for no authority, now accessible, can be compared with that of the three Apostles at Jerusalem. Yet even now approximations are possible. There is nothing to prevent sundered Churches from agreeing in judgment, and such agreement strengthens particular decisions. The recent ruling of the Patriarchal Council at Constantinople, and other Eastern authorities, that English ordinations are valid for economic recognition—it seems to go no further—is an instance. It means that the ritual essentials of those ordinations have been examined and verified.

An affirmative decision, unless adopted with indecent haste, is not likely to be withdrawn ; but a negative decision, a refusal of recognition, is

always open to revision. The possibilities of valid ordination have never been defined, are perhaps undefinable. They are God's secret, not hitherto revealed. It is possible that Innocent IV—or rather the Cardinal Sinibaldo Fieschi—was right in thinking that a bishop, touching a man's head and saying "Sis sacerdos," would make him a priest. It is possible that any act, any word, used with serious intent to place a man in the sacred ministry, would be effective. Even more daring hypotheses can be framed. But the Church does not act on a peradventure. The pastoral authority takes no account of such abstract hypotheses; it is enough to rule that such and such persons are to be accounted ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God; for the rest, *Non constat.*

So the Church judges an alleged ordination. Should the grace of sacred ministry be asserted apart from ordination, judgment must follow the same course. It is neither necessary nor possible to refute the assertion; what is necessary is to establish it. The claim cannot be set aside as impossible. The arm of God is not shortened;

what was done once in the case of St. Paul may be done a hundred times. The Church will judge on evidence. But with good reason we expect the work of God to be done with regularity, and therefore the investigation of the exceptional will be severe. If any man claim recognition like St. Paul, he must show as good credentials. Otherwise, *Non constat.*

I do not pursue the subject into the innovations and the discordant theories which the broken unity of Christendom has produced in recent centuries. Rash assertions, and denials not much less temerarious, have confused an issue which was once comparatively simple. A state of things exists which instantly demands an equitable settlement. But equity means an arrangement of conflicting claims, and the noise of conflict makes it difficult for anyone to hear reason. No practical settlement will come within sight until there is general agreement on certain fundamental propositions. I doubt whether any such agreement can be reached by the adjustment of existing discords. My suggestion is that we first turn our eyes away from the present confusion to the long period, by

no means free from troubles of its own, when there was at least a fundamental agreement on the subject of the sacred ministry. If that agreement is found to be fairly constant from the beginning of the Christian Church to the beginning of our present anxieties, we may reasonably expect a study of it to furnish some practical advice on the way to recover serenity. I am the more hopeful since the strenuous disputants of to-day, on all sides alike, may find in it elements which their keen advocacy is apt to overlook. Accepting these elements, they may find one another unexpectedly on common ground.

## CHAPTER V

## THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT

ST. PAUL bids the Ephesians be "diligent to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The injunction gives occasion to more than one question. In the first place, what is here meant by the Spirit? We have found elsewhere a certain ambiguity in St. Paul's use of the word, and a further ambiguity has been introduced by a novel use of our own day. This we must first put aside. We speak of the spirit in which something is done, meaning a disposition of will or temper; we speak of acting in a hostile spirit or in a friendly spirit; we describe men as being united in spirit when we wish to make light of their contrariety in action; other expressions of the same kind abound, until the whole meaning of the word evaporates. No such use or misuse of it is found in the writings

of the New Testament.[1] St. Paul does not mean by the unity of the spirit a generally diffused sense of good will, or an identity of purpose underlying superficial antagonisms.

The misunderstanding put aside, how shall we interpret the reference to the Spirit here? In one of his latest epistles St. Paul speaks to the Philippians of "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." In one of his earliest he tells the Galatians that "God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts." He speaks freely of the human spirit; in the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Romans the personal expression "my spirit" repeatedly occurs. He speaks with intense awe of "the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, of God," and more explicitly of "the Spirit which is from God." Here lies our choice.[2]

The third option seems to be ruled out. In what sense can men be said to keep or maintain

[1] The ordinary Greek word *θυμός*, corresponding to the Latin *animus*, is used in the New Testament only in a bad sense. The general sense is Hebraistically expressed by *καρδία, heart*, as in the older Greek poetry, or by periphrases like *τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες*, Phil. ii. 2.

[2] See Note H, *Πνεῦμα*, p. 241.

the unity of the Divine Spirit? It is spoken of as a work requiring diligence or earnest endeavour. It is therefore subject to failure. The unity of the Spirit of God cannot be dependent on human support.

In considering the other two options we must bear in mind the true humanity of the Spirit of Jesus, and the operation of the Holy Spirit thereon, which differs only in degree, not in kind, from the same operation directed to the spirit of Paul or of John. Here, again, how can our diligence, our endeavour, or our failure, affect the Spirit of Jesus? Are we, then, driven back on our remaining option? Must we make the unity of the spirit mean a close alliance of men? It will be little more than that union of hearts which we have already ruled out as inadequate. We may glance back at St. Paul addressing the Corinthians, "absent in body but present in spirit," and giving judgment, "ye being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus," upon the incestuous sinner. But he means something more than cordial agreement. When he wrote these words he does not seem to have reached his doctrine of the Body of Christ, but he was near

it, and he had learnt to say "We have the mind of Christ." Perhaps we may reckon that the mind of Christ is to be identified with "the power of the Lord Jesus," and this power with the Spirit of Christ. Then his meaning will be that he himself, and the Corinthians who sit with him in judgment, are spiritually conjoined with Christ, are partakers of the Spirit of Christ. When the doctrine of the Body of Christ is developed, this thought becomes more articulate, for the Spirit of Christ is the Soul, the life of the Body. The life, diffused through the members, is one and continuous, not so many individual lives, but its course through the members can be interrupted, and depends upon their good will to keep the channels open. Go a step further, say that a passive receptivity will not suffice, but an active response and a contributory effort is required: then you arrive at the need of diligence and earnest endeavour to keep the Unity of the Spirit.

I conclude that we must here understand St. Paul to speak of the Spirit of Christ operating as the Soul of the Church, which is his Body. The oneness of the Church, lately rescued from threats of disruption, is due to that one life of Christ

shared by Jew and Gentile. "Through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father." By the unity of the Spirit is clearly meant that which is indicated by a more usual term in an impassioned passage of the Epistle to the Philippians: "If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of charity, if any communion of spirit, if any intimate mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye be of the same mind, having the same charity, being of one soul, setting your minds on the one thing."[1] Communion of spirit, the partaking of a common life, is not a gift of God to be merely accepted; it cannot be achieved without a constant determination of the will; this is the strenuous endeavour by which the unity of the Spirit is to be maintained. The unity of the Spirit is oneness of operation.

But there is more to be said. The conception of unity is at once enlarged. There follows immediately a sevenfold amplification: "There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one

[1] Phil. ii. 1–2, where *κοινωνία πνεύματος* should be at once compared and contrasted with *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος* in 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

Hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all." It is impossible to dissever the One Spirit from the Spirit whose unity is to be maintained, the Soul of the Church ; and yet it is equally impossible, as Swete has convincingly said,[1] to dissociate the One Spirit from the One Lord and the One God and Father of all. The double connexion is not satisfactorily explained by a certain confusion besetting the use of the word in St. Paul's writings. It is perhaps true that he had not completely thought out his own doctrine of the Spirit ; the Catholic Church was in the same state of incompleteness for three centuries or more ; but the supposed confusion here would be too glaring for a mind like his ; we must look rather for one of his rapid transitions of thought. " One Body and one Spirit " follows naturally on the injunction to keep the unity of the Spirit ; but the prominence of the principle of unity in the whole work of God suddenly appeals to him, and he sees it all dependent on the universal oneness of God Himself. Various unities come to his mind

[1] Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 237.

in no logical order until he closes on the supreme Unity, perhaps not displeased to find himself arriving at the mystic Seven. He had not even begun to formulate the doctrine of Trinity in Unity, and therefore he could without anxiety leave the word "Spirit" to serve a double sense. But even then he has not yet done with the idea of oneness. Placing the word emphatically, he adds, "And to each *one* of us was grace given." The individuality of the member is not to be obscured by the unity of the Body. From the single human being up to God the rule of oneness prevails.

So St. Paul wrote in exuberant joy when a disruption of the Church had been averted. He might have treated the matter in a different fashion; as a politic arrangement, effected perhaps by a prudent compromise; as a discovery in conference that differences had been exaggerated; as a generous agreement to live and let live; as a federal union of competing sects. It is possible that to some of those concerned the transaction would present itself in one of these aspects. Not so to St. Paul. His completed doctrine of the Body of Christ gave him a more penetrating vision.

The competing sects consisted of members of that Body, however much at war with one another; their quarrel was intestine, and the horror of the situation lay in the fact that the Spirit of Christ dwelling in both parties was the very life-force in the strength of which they were rivals. "Is Christ divided?" he indignantly asked on the occasion of minor disputes at Corinth. On this occasion the reconciliation of parties had triumphantly demonstrated the unity of Christ.

It is impossible to avoid a hypothetic question. Would Christ have been divided if the reconciliation had not been made? We know enough about the circumstances to be aware that a large part of the Jewish faction ultimately broke away from the Church, reverting to the fanatical nationalism which plunged into war with Rome and utter ruin. St. Paul foresaw this falling away as the inevitable result of Judaizing within the Church. Foresight gave an edge to his denunciations in the Epistle to the Galatians: "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. . . . Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."

They were exaggerations at the moment, justified by later experience. Such a falling away is not the same thing as division within the Church. St. Paul's word for internal division is *schism* or *heresy*; both of which persist, with some added bitterness of intonation, in all the languages of Christendom. The corresponding word for such a falling away as we are now considering is *apostasy*. It was applied to St. Paul, as "forsaking Moses," by his opponents at Jerusalem; he applies it to others in the apocalyptic passage of his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians; it had been used of those among the Jews who conformed to the religious requirements of Antiochus Epiphanes.[1] In these cases complete separation from the Church is indicated, as also in St. John's Epistle: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us." These, he says, are not Christians at all, but "antichrists," and he is unwilling to admit that they can ever have had the life of Christ in them; yet they are in the very case contemplated in the apologue of the Vine,

[1] Acts xxi. 21; 2 Thess. ii. 3; 1 Macc. ii. 15.

which he has recorded elsewhere : " If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered."

As concerns apostates, then, we can answer our hypothetic question. Christ is not divided, but they are severed from Christ. One might ask whether the Body of Christ is not mutilated by an amputation, and hesitate over the reply.[1] Coming down from these heights to the level of plain experience, we shall obviously say that the Church may be weakened, as a society of men, by a serious defection ; but, regarded as the Body of Christ, it will not suffer loss by the removal of a tumour. In fine we shall do well to remember that the doctrine of the Body is so far metaphorical in form that analogies cannot be pressed to the uttermost. As concerns heresies or schisms, we have no such way of escape. St. Paul sorrowfully confessed that they were inevitable, but hoped they might serve a good end : " There must be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest." Divisions are a test of fidelity, and show what men are ; but the point is that they

[1] Compare Phil. iii. 2, *τὴν κατατομήν*.

are "among you." They are divisions within the Church. Apart from those minor heresies at Corinth, of which he was speaking, he must have had in mind his long conflict with the Judaizers. This also was a division within the Church. Yet the Church was one. It did not become One Body by the agreement, whatever it was, which is celebrated in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Long before that St. Paul had recognized it as the Body of Christ. Was Christ divided? We may here use analogy boldly, and observe that a human body can be torn by many grievous wounds without losing its identity or the oneness of its life. So the Body of Christ may be torn by schisms, and yet be undivided. Nor is it altogether incongruous that the Body of the Crucified should exhibit wounds among men. From the whole history of the Judaizers we may perhaps infer that heresy or schism does not separate believers from the One Body and the One Spirit, but that it tends to push one of the conflicting parties—or perhaps both—in the direction of apostasy.

The remedy is to keep the unity of the Spirit, "being of one soul, setting your minds on the

one thing." And this is a goal of human endeavour. Unity of spirit is not automatic unity. On the contrary, the vital effort needed for its attainment is liable to a misdirection which will cause division. Some of the greatest schisms of Christendom have been caused, not by a slackening of diligence, but by excess of zeal. To insist on " one thing "—a thing, perhaps, of great importance—when there is a genuine difference of judgment, to assert that a particular opinion is *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*, is to provoke open resistance. There are times when this must be done at all risks. St. Paul was right in refusing to allow the circumcision of Titus at Jerusalem, for he was bound to stand fast by his contention that circumcision was not necessary ; he threw on those who pressed for it as necessary the responsibility for the consequences, and the elder Apostles justified him. Yet he himself had Timothy circumcised at Lystra, waiving his contention that Gentile converts ought not to receive that mark of Judaism. In the one case he took the risk of disruption, in the other case he would not. In the third century, Stephen of Rome made a schism by insisting that converts

from heresy should be received without further baptism ; he was probably right, and the greater part of the Church has adhered to his judgment. Cyprian, stubbornly maintaining the contrary opinion, would not press it to an open breach of communion ; in this particular he also was justified by the subsequent practice of the Church, and for many centuries a similar difference of opinion between Easterns and Westerns was not allowed to affect their intercommunion. In the fourth century Athanasius insisted on the Nicene word *homoüsios*, and the history of Christian doctrine justifies him ; but he would not go with Lucifer of Cagliari and others who made it a badge of exclusive communion ; their intolerance produced forty years of multiple schism, his tolerance enabled him to join hands with those who held the truth without the word, and peace was restored to the Church. In the fifth and sixth centuries a verbal insistence on the dogmatic decree of Chalcedon regarding the Person of Christ made the Monophysite schism inevitable and incurable ; it was a blunder, says Duchesne,[1] for the adoption of the

[1] *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, tome iii, p. 457.

language of St. Cyril would have guarded the truth and placated the opposition ; the schism still continues after fourteen centuries, a strife about words and ancient grievances.

The history of these divisions, and of others which cannot be discussed with an equal detachment, affords a painful lesson, and one that is hard to learn. The unity of the Spirit can be achieved only with patience and tolerance, and by the exercise of a discretion outrunning zeal. But something else may be learnt, of countervailing value, less on the surface. Such divisions, though they tend to apostasy, do not always arrive. The separation of the Monophysites from the Church of Constantinople, with the local jealousies which partly caused it and were more largely embittered by it, had much to do with the defection of many Christians of the East under the impact of Islam. But a minority has stood firm under constant pressure of discouragement and occasional persecution. They show the fruits of the Spirit. Even before this tribulation, when they themselves often resorted to violence in their controversy with Chalcedonian orthodoxy, they suffered less deterioration than

might be expected. They had the tendency, characteristic of isolated Christian communities, to split into subordinate groups, but this has disappeared under the discipline of Moslem hostility. There now seems to be hardly a trace among them of the Eutychian heresy which the Council of Chalcedon condemned, but they repudiate the Council and stand apart from its adherents. The Orthodox still regard them as excluded from the Church, but live in amity with them and to a limited extent receive them into communion.

This is the oldest of the great schisms which to-day afflict the Christian Church, and it may be taken as a type of all. The schism of East and West, which came to a head in the eleventh century, differed from it in having no clear dogmatic issue as a starting-point, but is like it in most other respects. The rending of the Western Church at the Reformation was due to doctrinal differences far more extensive, though perhaps less fundamental, than those of the fifth century; and they bore fruit, as those did not, in violent changes of religious practice. The cleavage, therefore, is even more marked, and there is a temper of acquiescence in

it which would have been thought deplorable by those who made the original breach. They were all bent on reconstructing Christendom as a whole according to their several plans ; we, for the most part, have given up expecting any reconstruction, and the state of schism is treated as normal. An injunction to maintain the unity of the Spirit sounds like mockery. An attempt to recover it seems a forlorn hope.

Yet even this cheerless acquiescence provides some basis of activity. There is an abatement of controversial acrimony, and consequently more possibility of intercourse. To use an expressive modernism, we "get together," and find one another tolerable. Mutual tolerance is a necessary element in social union. Getting together does not always lead to agreement ; it may reveal unsuspected differences which are real ; but it does remove imaginary differences piled up by prejudice and ignorance. Within living memory there were many English Protestants for whom a Papist was hardly to be classed as Christian. I once knew an eager and fairly intelligent worker for the Christian Evidence Society, who on that

ground gently protested against the choice of such an one to serve on a committee. There may be survivors of that sort. I believe there are still some Catholics, not of the Roman persuasion only, who hesitate to give the name of Christian, except as a matter of courtesy, to the adherents of Protestant sects. When we get together, such judgments begin to appear ridiculous. If differences are disclosed, unexpected points of agreement emerge. Affirmations, however particular and distinctive, may be stoutly maintained, but negations are weakened.

We must not attribute this easement altogether to a growth of indifferentism. That is a real danger attending the decay of controversy, but what I have in mind, not without personal experience of it, is something more positive. Firmly holding our own convictions, and abating nothing of their religious importance, we find that others share them in a measure, expressing them in language traditionally supposed to be hostile. A man of great distinction at Oxford, after listening to an equally distinguished bishop, said abruptly, "That is quite true, but it is not the teaching of your

Church ; that is the orthodox Nonconformist point of view." If the bishop had been using technical language, the agreement would probably not have been discerned. The use, even in the most friendly discussion, of terms familiar only to one side, is a fruitful seed of misunderstanding ; where old suspicions and jealousies survive, it is even provocative. But on the other hand there is danger in the search of an expression which shall be acceptable, but may be accepted in a sense not altogether that of the propounder. There has been bitter experience of disappointment rising from this source. The difficulties of helpful debate in such intercourse are great, but they can be overcome.

Results are achieved which have at least a temporary value. The most exclusive Catholics—if such a term be not self-contradictory—who put all heretics outside the pale of the Church, are compelled to take account of facts disturbing to their theory. From the time of St. Cyprian onward, many have been disposed to deny any operation of the Spirit apart from Catholic communion. It was on this ground that Cyprian refused to acknowledge the validity of baptism

administered by schismatics; not having the Spirit, he argued, they can have no sacraments. He did not rule out only the teachers of fundamental error, Marcionites and Valentinians; he passed the same judgment on Novatian, whose treatise on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was of recognized value, and who went astray only on a point—an important point—of ecclesiastical discipline. The one thing fatal, according to Cyprian, was separation from the communion of the Catholic Church. He pushed his argument to the terrible conclusion that, even if one in this state of separation should die at the hands of persecutors for the Name of Christ, he is not to be reckoned a martyr, but is rather suffering for his faithlessness.[1] This opinion of the absolute invalidity of the sacraments of heretics could not stand in face of the steady witness of the Roman Church to the contrary part, but the acceptance of them raised obvious difficulties about the exclusion of their recipients from the pale of the Church, which were met by a theory of "revivi-

[1] De Unitate, 14; Ep. lv. 17, 29; lx. 4, "Fidei coronam non esse, sed poenam potius esse perfidiae."

scence." The origin of this was St. Augustine's doctrine of a "bar" (*obex*) which prevents the effective working of sacramental grace. Separation from the Church is such a bar ; when it is removed by reconciliation, there is a revival of the dormant gift of grace, which then has free course to its perfect work. The explanation involves a strange discontinuity in the operation of the Spirit.

An objection of another order appears when patent marks of the work of grace are observed in those excluded from the pale of the Church. Theory begins to give way before facts. Cardinal Manning, influenced in part by his own memories, emphatically asserted the working of sacramental grace outside the Roman communion. Manifest tokens of the life of the Spirit in persons theoretically excluded from the Church call for some modification of theory. Hence a distinction : such persons are said to be, not indeed of the Body of the Church, but of the Soul of the Church. I am reluctant to speak slightingly of any way of escape from an intolerable position, but this distinction seems to make havoc of the whole doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. Body and soul are so far

one that their severance is death ; soul is the formative principle of body, animating alike the whole and the several members, but the members only as parts of the whole. To be animated by the Soul of the Body of Christ is nothing else but to be a member of the Body.

We are not speaking of extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, which may be given to any man ; we are speaking of the ordinary gifts and graces of the Christian life. That life is lived in the Body of Christ, by the power of the Spirit of Christ, which is the Soul of the Body. We have no reason to suppose that it can be lived otherwise. Therefore if manifest tokens of that life are seen in persons shut out from communion with any Christians, many or few, the conclusion is irresistible that they are not shut out entirely from communion with the Church. They participate in its life. They are of the Body of the Church. Heresy or schism, therefore, does not necessarily involve severance from the Church. It is a wound of the Body, a division within the Body. We return by a circuit to St. Paul's language : " There must be heresies among you." The inevitability of it has to

be faced, and the effect should not be exaggerated. It is bad enough. The unity of the Spirit is evidently not being maintained. But neither is it entirely destroyed ; it still exists, actually or potentially. Heresy or schism does not of itself cut off the erring member. Nothing short of apostasy can do that.

Then what is apostasy ? " They went out from us," says St. John, and he calls them antichrists. They set themselves against Christ. How ? He gives two examples. " This is the antichrist, he that denieth the Father and the Son." That is the denial of the unique relation of Christ to God. " Hereby know ye the Spirit of God : every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God : and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God : and this is the spirit of the antichrist." The immediate reference is apparently to some kind of docetic gnosticism, a denial of the Incarnation. But a similar definition by St. Paul gives a larger sense. Much earlier, and probably before the appearance of this special error, he writes to the Corinthians : " No man speaking in the Spirit of God saith ' Anathema Jesus ' ; and no man can say ' Lord Jesus,' but in the Holy

Spirit." The former declaration seems obvious; the latter calls for explication to a reader of to-day. Deissmann, in his *Licht vom Osten*, has revealed by linguistic study the exact significance of "Kyrios Iesus." The invocation is a direct confession that Jesus is God. Only by grace of the Holy Spirit, says St. Paul, can any man arrive at conviction of that truth. He thus makes the use of the invocation a positive test of Christianity. He does not make the non-user of it a negative test, but St. John would apparently do so, and this accords with other indications of apostolic custom. In the Epistle to the Romans, to " confess with the mouth Kyrios Iesus " is a condition of salvation; in the Acts of the Apostles, Christians are " they which invoke this Name "; there is reason to think that the word " Christian " was invented at Antioch as a cult-name for those who worshipped Christ as God. Seventy years later, in Bithynia, Pliny found that it was a distinctive mark of Christians to " sing a hymn to Christ as God." To refuse this homage would certainly be an act of apostasy. The test, whether positive or negative, remains applicable. In conversation with a public man of high char-

acter, but of no conspicuously religious standing, I took exception to something which he said about the practice of polygamy in Africa; he replied, as if resenting an imputation, "I hope you don't think that I am not a Christian." I hesitated, not expecting this tone, and he continued, "I believe that Jesus Christ is God." I could only tell him that the confession was conclusive.

In accordance with this principle the Lambeth Conference of 1920—I refrain from calling it a General Council only because it did not assume the title—declared that "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body." For, indeed, to be a Christian is to be a member of Christ.[1] There is in reality no such thing as a Christian unattached, though the name may be loosely applied to men sharing with Christians certain

[1] In a small volume entitled *The Universal Church*, dealing specifically with the Lambeth declaration, I have collected from various sources, and in particular from the new *Codex Juris Canonici* of the Roman Church, evidence of the canonical treatment of heretics and schismatics as within the Catholic Church.

sentiments, or a certain measure of civilization. The mention of Baptism in this declaration must obviously be read in connexion with that extension of the idea of baptism which justifies us in speaking of the Baptism of Blood or the Baptism of Desire. But further it is necessary to remember that Catechumens have usually been reckoned as Christians, since they are in the way to baptism ; indeed, in the older ritual books of the Church the rubric "*ad faciendum Christianum*" is not appended, as one might expect, to the Order of Baptism, but to the form for making a Catechumen. It is assumed that baptism will follow, or at least that there is a desire and intention to be baptized. What should be said of one—if any such there be—who professes belief in Christ as God but refuses baptism, is not so clear. It may perhaps be held that his profession of belief is nullified by unwillingness to act upon it, unless indeed excusable ignorance can be pleaded on his behalf. Something of this kind would probably be the judgment of the Church at large.

A certain unity of Spirit is evidently the basis of this recognition of men as Christians and

members of Christ's Body. It stands in the confession, explicit or implied, that Jesus is God. Agreement on this head shows that they participate in that life of the Church which is lived by the power of the Holy Ghost. So far they have the Mind of Christ. They are united in the Spirit of Christ, which is the Soul of the Church, as were the first believers whose creed was little more than that of the Chamberlain of Candace : " I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." It is but a beginning, but the whole faith of the Gospel is implicitly there. To keep this unity of the Spirit is their first task, and amid the divisions of Christendom that alone is a work of strenuous endeavour. Those divisions tend to produce the canker of Indifferentism, which is a practical denial of the existence of any fundamental truths of Christianity, and from such indifferentism to apostasy is a short step. To keep even so much of this unity as remains there is need of constant watchfulness and effort. But further, this unity needs enlargement. Questions calling for answer must arise, and those who have the Spirit of Christ should agree in the answer. Not every question can be so answered.

I have had occasion to call attention to the necessary limitations of the Mind of Christ, which limit also the authority of the Church in matters of controversy. Some questions have been closed by the general agreement of Christians, which it would be presumptuous to reopen. There are *dogmata*, settled judgments of the whole Church, which must be accepted if the unity of the Spirit is to be kept. Other questions have been opened and remain open. The sternest dogmatic theologians recognize the existence of open questions which may never be closed. These make severe demands on the patience of those who think they can see a solution ; they are entitled to put it forward controversially ; it may even be their duty to do so, but they have no right to condemn others who reject their conclusions. It is possible to conduct controversy in the unity of the Spirit, but it is extremely difficult ; the conjunction of zeal and patience is one of the conditions necessary for laboriously safeguarding unity. Some of the worst divisions in the Church have been the result of rash attempts to close an open question.

The work enjoined on us by St. Paul is arduous

and continuous ; never, perhaps, more arduous than in our own day. We have not only to keep what we have, but also to recover much that has been lost. It is no wonder that some shrink from the toil, and try to imagine for themselves an easier way. They are not without excuse. It may seem strange that the Church of Christ, divinely ordered and inspired, should need these wearisome methods of debate and agreement. An appointed machinery, working with the smoothness and inevitability of the cosmic process, unfailing and unerring, might be expected to lead us into all truth. Some spiritual authority, easily accessible and capable of solving every doubt that may arise, might have been provided for the furtherance of God's purpose. Such an authority has been sought, in more than one direction, but in vain. For such is not God's purpose. The Kingdom of Heaven is not a mechanical Cosmos ; it is a kingdom of men whom God calls to be fellow-workers with Himself. Through them he works out his purpose. With infinite patience—*patiens quia aeternus*—he endures their failures and perversities, because the work is to be theirs in partnership.

He does not impose on them unity according to his will, but requires of them an effort to attain it. There is a gift of unity which we must guard and keep, a real unity not of our own making ; but from this there is an advance to be made, always in the power of the Spirit of Christ, " until we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." When the Lord Jesus prayed, " that they all may be one," he was not declaring an immutable law of life in the Church. On the contrary he was desiring an achievement that would depend on human endeavour.

## CHAPTER VI

## THE BOND OF PEACE

THE maintenance of the Unity of the Spirit which God has given, and also, no doubt, the advance to a larger unity containing the fulness of Christ, is said by St. Paul to be effected "in the bond of peace." Here is a word which we find him using only in this passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and in the kindred Epistle to the Colossians; elsewhere in the canonical books of the New Testament it occurs only in the Acts, where Peter charges Simon Magus with falling "into gall of bitterness and a bond of iniquity." It is, however, a word of common use, literal or metaphorical, for any kind of ligament binding men or things together. This being the necessary meaning of the word, there is an implied contrast between the Unity of the Spirit and the Bond of Peace. The Unity of the

Spirit is the inmost organic unity of the Body of Christ, the Bond of Peace is an external support, a wrapper that prevents disintegration. It may be called an instrument used by men for the work of maintaining unity.

What is this instrument? It is the bond of peace. But does this mean a bond producing peace or a bond consisting of peace? Either sense is grammatically good, the latter preferable; but there is a weakness with the effect of anticlimax in saying that we should cultivate the Unity of the Spirit by living peaceably with each other. The Epistle to the Colossians favours the other sense. There the word is first used in striking metaphor of the ligaments attaching the joints of the Body of Christ as it grows to its full development. Immediately afterwards, in a passage dealing with Christian conduct, we read of "charity, which is the bond of perfectness." It is impossible to overlook the sequence of thought here, or its extension to the "bond of peace" in the contemporaneous epistle. The bond of perfectness can be nothing but an instrumental cause of full-growth; the bond of peace can be nothing but an instrumental cause of

peace within the Body of Christ. And we learn what is this bond. It is *agape*, charity.

This Greek word until recently had not been found anywhere but in the text of the Septuagint and of the New Testament, or in writings dependent thereon. It was therefore supposed to have by origin a special religious character. The supposition can be no longer maintained, and the word takes its proper place as a natural product of the current speech of the hellenized East. By derivation it should mean an affection based on regard for character or on the pleasure of intercourse, as distinct from the passion of love and the sentiment of friendship.[1] Speaking of it in English, we cannot avoid the ambiguous word "love," but the particular sense required should be always borne in mind. As a Christian virtue, and the supreme virtue, Charity means a delight in our relation to God, and in all that flows from that relation. "We love because he first loved us." To love God is to love all who stand in the same relation of charity with God; "for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot

[1] Note I. *Ἀγάπη*, p. 244.

be loving God whom he hath not seen." The brotherhood here in view is the whole family of God's children, but specifically it is the company of those who are gathered into the Church of Christ; to be in charity with them is to regard them in that specific character with an affection based, not on their own worth or attractiveness, but on their value as members of Christ. Such affection is evidence of the new life imparted to the members of Christ's Body. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." It is, indeed, the activity of that life.

If Charity is the virtue of the soul which provides the bond of peace, the corporate and visible manifestation of it is Communion. The importance of this word in the writings of the New Testament is obscured for English readers by varieties of translation.[1] When all its uses are compared, it will be seen how comprehensive is the idea unfolded. Partnership, or a sharing in all good things, appears at the base, but this involves also a partnership in the trials and sufferings to which the Christian

[1] See Note K. *Κοινωνία*, p. 247.

disciple was committed by the circumstances of his religious profession, and this again was treated as partnership in the passion of the Redeemer. Mutual help and the maintenance of the destitute were included, and in particular the contributions of the faithful for the support of their pastors. The work of the sacred ministry was a partnership bearing the same designation, and when St. Paul was recognized by the elder Apostles as their equal, he describes the scene by saying that they gave him "right hands of communion." The alms given by one local Church to another, on which St. Paul laid great stress, were a "communion of service to the saints," and he spoke of a reciprocal communication of spiritual gifts constituting a kind of equitable exchange. There is a common faith and a common salvation, shared by all alike. Conversely there is such a thing as partnership in one another's sins, the sharing of a common guilt, against which a warning is uttered. At a higher level there is in the worship of the Christian community a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, the sacrifice of our redemption ; there is a communion of the Holy Spirit, which seems to be

something more than the bestowal of spiritual gifts upon individual believers; to crown all, there is a promised participation of the divine nature, a transcendent experience of union with the Godhead. This height is to be reached not by the Platonic ascent, by flight alone to the Alone, but by a scale of practical virtues culminating in brotherly love and charity.

Such is the Communion of the Christian religion. The ultimate expression of it was perhaps not yet uttered when St. Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles, but the rest of its significance can hardly have been absent from the mind of an intimate friend of St. Paul, and he used the word significantly in his account of the first stage in the corporate life of the Church. He says that the earliest believers "continued steadfast in the Communion," not otherwise than as if this were the recognized designation of the society into which they were gathered. It is probable, however, that he is casting the light of his mature experience on those origins, and he seems to indicate an elementary use of the term by adding, as an explanation, that "they had all things common." It is

not without significance that this word had become for the Jews, as for us, a term of disparagement. It stood for that which was common to the whole human race, as distinct from the special privileges and practices of the elect People of God. It was thus equivalent to "unclean." That word and its cognates the Christian Church adopted for the designation of its own privileges and sacred functions. By accident or by design, partnership in the Common came to stand, by contrast with Jewish exclusiveness, for the catholicity of the Christian Church.

The idea of Communion was therefore become rich in content. We may say that it stood for the practice of charity, at its lowest and at its highest, and the general use of the word suggests the identity of this practice at every level. It implies, moreover, an organization of the Christian people for promoting the multifarious works of charity. This organization is not to be confused with the Church. Believers themselves are the Church, the Body of Christ. But they are nowhere represented as a loosely gathered multitude, bound together only by a sentiment, be it the most exalted

sentiment of loyalty to Christ the King, or the most active sense of a common enjoyment of spiritual gifts. Their commonalty is expressed in external works of mutual charity, done in a social order, and for this achievement some mode of organization is necessary. No one mode is indicated as indispensable, but some stable elements may be discerned. St. Luke links with Communion the Apostolic Teaching, the Breaking of Bread, and the Prayers, to which also the first believers steadily adhered. He writes long after the origins which he is describing; we can hardly doubt that he recognizes these four elements as permanent. And such they have proved to be. The Apostolic Teaching became in history a traditional body of doctrine, guarded and delivered by an Apostolic Pastorate, and its delivery became so intimately associated with Baptism as to be almost a part of it; the Breaking of the Bread was already in the first age an act of public worship; the Prayers acquired an orderly procedure, gradually crystallizing into a Ritual. But we may observe that the other three fall under the head of Communion at its widest extension. They are modes of communion. We

may say, then, that Communion is the whole practice of charity, mediated by the organization of the Church. It is an external Bond of Peace, within which the Unity of the Spirit shall be maintained.

It is surprising to note the absence of a word so prominent in the Apostolic writings from the Christian literature of the succeeding age. We have, it is true, no copious store of such literature, but in what we have there are passages in which we should expect to find explicit mention of Communion. There is none. A form of the word used with a very definite sense emerges in the account written by Irenaeus of Polycarp's visit to Rome for the purpose of discussing with Anicetus the proper date for keeping Easter. The Churches of Asia and the Church of Rome were in disagreement, and their divergence of practice was endangering the unity of the Catholic Church. Neither bishop, he says, was able to convince the other, but nevertheless they held together in Communion, and to make this manifest Anicetus invited Polycarp to take his place at the celebration of the Eucharist. The critical word [1] is introduced as

[1] *Ἐκοινώνησαν.* See Note K, p. 251.

a matter of course, without explanation, and we cannot doubt that it was in current use. Not many years later there is abundant evidence of this, and it becomes again one of the most ordinary terms of Christian speech.

It cannot, however, be said to retain the whole wealth of content which it had in the mouth of St. Paul. What it has retained is that part of the original meaning which attaches it to the organization by which the external unity of the Church is guarded. I have anticipated in the last chapter much that belongs to this part of my argument; here it must be set out in a more orderly fashion.

In the third century Communion was understood in two aspects: there was the Communion of a particular local Church, and there was the Communion of the Catholic or universal Church. But these were closely related.

The Communion of a particular Church centred in the Bishop. To accept his pastoral rule, and to be recognized by him, was to be in Communion. For a sufficiently grave cause, he could put anyone out of Communion; but penitents under discipline, though deprived of many rights in the Church

were not in this way excluded. This function of holding the community together was the ground for a strict rule against the establishment of more than one bishop in the same city ;[1] the extent and the limits of his authority in the rural districts about the city were not yet marked out. So much depended upon him that in his absence grave disorders might be expected. Some authority then devolved on the priests and deacons of the place, but questions arose which they were unable to solve, and disorders or sharp divisions ensued. The Epistles of St. Cyprian afford evidence of this both at Carthage during his retirement under persecution, and at Rome during the months which followed the martyrdom of his contemporary Fabian. The importance of the bishops was so well understood that the Emperor Decius apparently hoped to paralyse the Church by striking at them, and fifty years later Diocletian made the same attempt in a more systematic fashion.

Under the bishop the Communion of the local

[1] It has been thought that the general establishment of monepiscopacy as distinguished from the rule of a presbyteral college was intended to secure this kind of unity ; but there is no evidence of this.

Church was a very close affair, touching human life at every point. There is reason to believe that at Rome, for the security of a recognized position before the law, it was organized as a burial-guild with its own cemeteries. Everywhere it seems to have played the part of a benefit society. There was a common fund, which supplied a maintenance for the clergy, high and low, as also for widows and orphans ; relief was given also to those who suffered in their fortunes from the restraint imposed by the Church on the pursuit of certain occupations. One of the earlier letters of St. Cyprian illustrates this. He advises a neighbouring bishop that a Christian who is continuing his professional work of training boys for the stage should be put out of Communion, but if he gives up this profitable employment he should be provided with sustenance by the Church ; if the funds available are inadequate, he may come to Carthage where he shall be supplied at least with food and raiment.[1] It is evident that excommunication was not only exclusion from certain religious observances. Communion was under-

[1] Cypr. Ep. 2.

stood in a wide sense, including some temporal advantages ; or we may say more religiously that the communal life of the Church stood in the exercise of mutual charity on an extended scale. Such was the Bond of Peace in a local Church, when completely organized.

We are not to suppose that the organization was perfect, or worked without friction. Human nature is always much the same, except in some few matured saints, and it is prone to disagreement. If St. Paul thought that in his own day heresies and schisms were inevitable within the Church, and that apostasies from the Church were no less to be expected, we shall not look for any period of ecclesiastical history free from these troubles. What I would observe is the way of dealing with them. According to St. John, Diognetus seems to have been over hasty in treating as apostates men who were perhaps no more than tiresome heretics. He has had many successors. In the second century Victor of Rome refused to communicate with the Quartodecimans of Asia, whom his predecessor Anicetus had treated with the utmost consideration, and " tried to cut them off,"

says Eusebius, "from the common unity." [1] He has had many imitators. But normally the practice of the Church, even in the worst days of heresy-hunting, has leaned to patience, and the inquisitor could say without hypocritical pretence that his purpose was to retain the suspect within the pale of salvation. Separation has usually been the work of heretics themselves. Yet not all of these are to be reckoned apostates, nor have they been so treated.

A faction troubling a local Church might go to the length of withdrawing from the bishop's Communion. So parted, it might claim to be the authentic Church of the place, and procure the appointment of a bishop. Such an one is called by St. Cyprian *pseudoepiscopus*. There is possibly an intimation of this in the account of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, circulated by the Church of Smyrna, where he is called "bishop of the catholic Church in Smyrna." The intention may be to distinguish him from a bishop presiding over a separated community of this kind. If so, it is the earliest

[1] Euseb. H. E. v. 24: *Ἀποτέμνειν τῆς κοινῆς ἑνώσεως πειρᾶται.*

known use of the word "catholic" as opposed to "heretical."[1] This, however, is but conjecture. The earliest schism of this kind actually recorded is that of Novatian against Cornelius at Rome in the year 251; thirty years earlier, also at Rome, Hippolytus has been shown by Döllinger to have led a similar revolt against Callistus. The Roman Church, indeed, perhaps by reason of its eminence, has been peculiarly unhappy in this respect; more than thirty antipopes, as they are usually called, have been reckoned from the third to the fifteenth century. In the terrible confusion which ensued after the persecution of Diocletian, a like schism was made at Carthage, where Majorinus was put forward for the purpose of ousting Caecilian. The leader of this movement was Donatus, the neighbouring bishop of Casae Nigrae, who for some reason had been living at Carthage; from him, or from another Donatus who succeeded Majorinus, the resulting schism has received in history the name of Donatist. In the year 330

[1] *Mart. S. Polycarpi*, 16: *Ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.* Lightfoot substitutes from one MS. the reading *ἁγίας*, against which Funk has convincingly argued.

Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was removed by an Arian intrigue, and another of doubtful orthodoxy substituted, whom the faithful, gathered round a priest named Paulinus, refused to acknowledge. In 360 Meletius succeeded ; Eustathius was now dead, but those with Paulinus still held aloof. Two years later an attempt was made by a Council at Alexandria under Athanasius to compose the disagreement ; but one of the bishops sent to effect this was the firebrand of orthodoxy, Lucifer of Cagliari, who broke away from his instructions and made matters worse by consecrating Paulinus bishop. There was thus a completed schism at Antioch.

The nature of these schisms should be clearly understood. There was no pretence of setting up two rival Churches. Each of the competitors claimed to be the one sole bishop of the whole Church in the place affected. That Church was therefore torn by faction ; its Communion was broken up. Either party might affirm that the other was cut off altogether from the Church, and Cyprian's rigid theory drove him to this judgment ; one bishop with his following was the true Church,

the other with his supporters was outcast. But that judgment was not consistently accepted by the Church at large when measures were taken to deal with the consequent troubles. Such measures were necessary. These three schisms, unlike many others that occurred in that time of distress, had consequences reaching far beyond the particular Churches concerned.

The consequences are found in the other aspect of the Communion of the Church. We are not to think of the organization of the catholic Church as a federal union of independent local Churches. We must see the Communion of the whole Church as one, just as the Communion of the local Church is one. And as the one bishop is the organ of unity in the local Church, so the whole of the episcopate throughout the world is one, and is the organ of unity in the catholic Church. This is the key to much confused history. Here again Cyprian's lawyer-like reasoning went beyond the practice of the time in applying the Roman conception of a *collegium* to the working of the system; but he knew the practice, and did not falsify it. A newly

elected and consecrated bishop notified his appointment by letters to the bishops of important Churches in his neighbourhood and elsewhere : their recognition established him in the Communion of the catholic Church. The correspondence of Cyprian about the schism of Novatian gives us the whole process in detail. Cornelius, elected and consecrated, wrote to some of the African bishops, who happened to be meeting at Carthage for one of their usual councils. Before they had verified his credentials, letters came also from Novatian saying that he, and not Cornelius, was the true bishop. The council therefore suspended judgment, sending two of its members to make inquiry at Rome. When a report was received showing that the election of Cornelius was prior to that of Novatian, and was in all respects regular, the assembled African bishops at once recognized him and reported the decision by letters to other bishops. A phrase used in these letters, and repeated some months later in a personal letter by Cyprian, is illuminating. The bishops were told that by communicating with Cornelius, and not with Novatian, they would be adhering to the unity

and charity of the Catholic Church.[1] The words *communcatio* and *communio* are here used in the largest sense, further explicated by the addition of *caritas*. It is Cyprian's fundamental conviction that the unity of the Catholic Church stands in mutual charity, and is expressed by the mutual communion of bishops ; this is the " glue " that holds all together.[2]

There is no reason to suppose that he was inventing anything, he did but reduce to a rigid theory the practice of his day. The theory was too rigid for life, and left some things out of account. It therefore broke down within his own experience, and more decisively afterwards. It had two consequences : to communicate with a *pseudoepiscopus* was to become an outcast ; to be out of communion with a true bishop was to incur the same fate. The latter consequence soon recoiled upon himself. In the controversy about the baptism of heretics, Cyprian stood for mutual tolerance in disagreement ;

[1] Cypr. Ep. xlviii. 3 ; lv. 1.

[2] Cypr. Ep. lxviii. " Copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiae mutuae glutino atque unitatis uinculo copulatum." *Sacerdos* with him is always a bishop.

Stephen of Rome would have none of it, and he excluded Cyprian from communion with him. How did matters stand? Either Stephen or Cyprian was an outcast. It is impossible to say what might have ensued, for developments were cut short; within very few months the two opponents were happily united in martyrdom.

The other consequence has a long history. Cyprian could see clearly that anyone communicating with Novatian was outcast. But many bishops did communicate with Novatian, and these saw as clearly that anyone communicating with Cornelius was an outcast; it was therefore their duty, and perhaps their pleasure, to plant a Novatianist bishop in every Church where a following could be got together. Thus the trouble, which was at first local and the affair only of the Roman Church, grew to a widespread schism. The same result followed in the same way from the Donatist schism at Carthage. Cyprian's theory afforded no remedy. His atomic construction of the Church, in which every bishop was independent of all others and accountable only to God, reduced him to pitiful evasions for the removal of an obviously unfit

bishop, and the evasions were inoperative on a large scale.

A remedy was found in the development of the conciliar meetings of bishops which can be traced very far back, and find a precedent in the meetings of Apostles at Jerusalem recorded by St. Paul and St. Luke. Given the complete equality of bishops, it is fairly obvious that a group of bishops may have authority superior to that of any single bishop, and even authority over him. His independence, argued by Cyprian, was independence only as against any other single bishop ; his accountability to God alone was safeguarded by a belief in the operation of the Holy Spirit controlling the action of a Council. We need not suppose that men consciously worked out the development in this way ; its arrival was rather acknowledged, after the event, as due to the same divine operation. It was soon supplemented by the recognition of a right of presidency in the bishop of the metropolis of each province or larger division of the Roman Empire, and these were again grouped under the leadership of nine or ten principal Sees, of which Rome was naturally the chief ; the Eastern Churches

beyond the Empire also conformed more or less to this model. When the acuteness of the Arian controversy passed, local schisms were thus kept in check, but disputes between the greater Sees were not so easily controlled. The danger and its avoidance are illustrated by the Meletian schism at Antioch. The Roman Church communicated with Paulinus and repelled Meletius; most of the Eastern Churches communicated with Meletius and repelled Paulinus. Meletius presided in the Council held at Constantinople in the year 381. Something worse than Donatism seemed to be in view. An ingenious theory of *mediate* Communion has saved the situation. The Roman Church was in Communion with the Eastern Churches which were in Communion with Meletius; therefore the Roman Church also was mediately, though not immediately, in Communion with him, and the Council of Constantinople has been recognized by Rome as ecumenical.

Evasions of this kind should not be treated with contempt. They are a way of safeguarding the principle of mutual communion as the Bond of Peace, without allowing a rigid application of the

principle to cripple the abundant life of the Church. They supply a lesson showing that when theory of the soundest kind threatens a deadlock, the free working of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ will effect a release.

It is for this reason that I have enlarged on this formative period in the history of ecclesiastical institutions. I pass over the sad story of the great regional schisms in the East, born of the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries. They teach us nothing further except a humbling lesson of the obstinacy with which such divisions persist when their cause has all but disappeared. I once asked an Armenian archbishop whether in the view of his Church there was anything seriously objectionable in the definition of Chalcedon. He replied that there was not. I then asked him whether, in that case, the Armenian Church could not generously accept the definition, and so close a schism of fourteen centuries. He shook his head, and replied that nothing but a new Ecumenical Council could set things right.

Among the Western Churches there was for many centuries abundant heresy and local schism,

but the development of the Roman Papacy does seem to have prevented the rise of such great regional divisions. On one occasion, however, it was itself the cause of danger. I have spoken of the many antipopes. The fifteenth century saw the worst and the last of them. The last was merely a transient phantom. Before him came the time when three claimants, all more or less disreputable, disputed the Chair of St. Peter. There was no authority competent to judge a Pope, though some daring speculators thought that a General Council might be so bold. There was therefore none that could judge between the claimants. The Church was divided ; obedience was rendered here to one claimant, there to another. At last France withdrew obedience from all three, and England soon did the same ; it seemed that national Churches might emerge. Then the Council of Constance met, refused to claim the power of judging which Gerson ascribed to it, but swept aside the three claimants under various pretexts, and procured by thoroughly irregular means the election of a new Pope whom all should accept. Once more sanctified common-sense drove a way through the trammels of theory,

though these were now solidified into a received body of law.

I am not concerned with the character of the revived Papacy, except so far as its corrupt practices led within a century to the next great cataclysm. The Reformation opens a new chapter.

To prepare for it we must observe that hitherto all schisms, with negligible exceptions, had themselves been founded on the ordinary constitution of the Church ; and they were healed, if at all, by the application of the very principle from which they started. It was applied, as I have suggested, with wise accommodation. The Donatists pressed it to the uttermost, asserting that they alone were the true Church, and putting all other Christians beyond the pale. Their Catholic opponents, on the other hand, refused to regard them as altogether outcast ; Optatus did not scruple to offend them by calling them " brothers," and asserting the identity of their sacraments with his own ; Augustine laboriously persuaded them to " come in," and their bishops were confirmed, when it was possible, in their Sees. Nothing else was required. The manners of the Novatianists are less well known.

Strong in their stern doctrine of discipline, they called themselves Cathari, or puritans, and scorned the laxity of the Catholics, but they seem to have abated their exclusiveness ; one of their bishops is said to have sat in the Council of Nicaea, and it is on record that the Council made easy terms for their reconciliation and admission to Communion. Nothing but reconciliation was needed. Their principles and their doctrine, apart from the practice of penance, were entirely orthodox, and they were easily, though slowly, absorbed into Catholic Communion. Simpler even than this, though always difficult, was the closing of a regional schism, unless it were complicated by serious theological differences. In this case, explanations or admissions of error might be needed ; otherwise, nothing but renewal of Communion, the organization being intact on both sides. Such schisms were frequent ; Duchesne has reckoned that from the year 323 to 787, the Roman Church and the Eastern Episcopate were out of Communion with each other during various periods amounting to two hundred and three years.[1] Other schisms

[1] *Églises séparées*, p. 164.

followed, always healed with a little accommodation. The more enduring division, still unhealed, which dates from the year 1054, was originally of the same kind, though more embittered ; twice before the end of the fifteenth century there were vigorous and partly successful attempts to bring it to an end, which eventually broke down over the question of the prerogatives of the Roman See, and this appears to be still the only effective bar to union.

The Reformation, I have said, opens a new chapter. It is enough to look round at the present state of Christendom, comparing it with that which I have been describing. The contrast is startling. It is not, perhaps, that there is more division now than then ; it is that we see divisions of a different kind. No longer are we confronted only with breaches of Communion dividing a great organization which is fundamentally the same in all its parts ; there are sections which have established an entirely different organization. That which was the Bond of Peace, liable to rupture but capable of being restored by a natural process like a broken bone well set, has been in part shattered

and comminuted, beyond apparent hope of repair ; what remains of it is broken in pieces, large or small.

It is not to be supposed that the leaders of the Reformation looked for this result. They set out to reform the whole Church on their own lines, and they began the work with a reasonable hope of success. Quarrels among themselves darkened that hope, and the counter-reformation killed it. But this partial success left the defenders of the old order timid and distrustful. There followed what Mr. Wilfred Ward has called a "state of siege," and the Papacy, once the most unifying of powers, has become repellent, patient of schism if the remnant of its followers can be held in the closer guard.

Hence the religious conditions into which our generation has been born. The state of Christendom has been for some centuries a state of settled disunion. It has been accepted as a matter of course, and has even been defended ; a certain rivalry of Christian sects is extolled as a wholesome emulation, or as securing a richness of varied religious experience. Reunion seems an idle dream, or an aspiration not entirely good. Effects

of this attitude of mind are seen everywhere. What is praiseworthy is affected for evil, and what is blameworthy takes a worse colour. Persecution loses what faint excuse it may have had. When St. Augustine, departing from his earlier judgment, made a half-hearted defence of the imperial oppression of the Donatists on the ground that it was an attempt to "compel them to come in," we may applaud the motive even while condemning the practice, and that was for a long time at least the professed aim of mutual persecution among Christians; but it is impossible to bring the horrible Wars of Religion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries under the shelter of this disguise. The outcome of that long struggle was a mutual toleration of the two main parties, but a toleration of impotence, not of conviction, as was shown where armed resistance to persecution became impossible. Rival religions were solidly entrenched within their several territories, and the sense of a united Christendom was weakened almost to extinction.

Religious disunion has been fortified by the growing spirit of nationalism, the nationalism which first became prominent in the fifteenth

century at the Council of Constance, organized on the basis of Nations. That purely ecclesiastical assembly has been called, with pardonable exaggeration, the first International Congress of the States of Europe. The Church of Rome has, on the whole, stood firm against this development ; for the dominating Italian influence in its counsels should rather be called regional than national, and was in full force long before the emergence of Italian nationality ; but the Protestant and Reformed Churches have acquired by lapse of time a national character of which they showed at first few traces.

It is not my task to account for the decay of the persecuting temper in modern times, but I have to observe that there has been substituted for it a contemptuous sort of tolerance which is hardly more Christian. I do not speak of that worldly toleration which is due to religious indifference, but of men distinguished by genuine religious convictions, who are content to let other Christians go their own way, asking for themselves only the same liberty of isolation. This temper is a repudiation of the truth that we are all members one of another. And it is general. Proselytism there is, in the

form of attempts to draw believers from one Christian communion to another, and it is sometimes of a kind to deserve the evangelic reproof addressed to the proselyting zeal of the Pharisees, but this does not abate disunion. On the contrary, however justifiable it may be, or seem to be, as a way of winning souls to a fuller knowledge of the truth or to a purer conception of the gospel, it accentuates the division of Christians into mutually exclusive communities.

It would be easy to enlarge on painful details of this state of things, details of wasted energy, of sordid competition, of dishonest controversy. But in doing this I should incur the danger of slipping into the very faults which were exposed; and there would be more than a danger, indeed a certainty, of making the accusation turn upon accidental and separable features of sectarianism. Even if these be inevitable, it is not on account of them that sectarian separation is to be deplored. Good men may deplore them, and strenuously avoid them, without deploring their cause. Indeed it is not the only cause. Such evil exhibitions of a degraded religiosity are not peculiar to the present state of

Christendom. They have occurred under wholly different conditions. To insist upon them exclusively, or even chiefly, is to miss the true ground of complaint, and to suggest that the elimination of them would render the existing conditions tolerable. There are discernible signs of a policy directed to this end. Much discussion of Christian union seems to aim at nothing more than escape from the obvious scandals of disunion. To live and let live without unseemly competition appears to be the goal of endeavour. Peace of a sort might thus be attained, but it would not amount to a bond of peace. Something more is sought; a kind of alliance in good works, or even a federation of separate communities for the pursuit of common aims. There is a bond here, but it is a bond of policy, not the bond of a common life, a communion of charity. The federated communities would still be fundamentally separate. If by an amazing effort, crowned with amazing success, all Christians could be brought together in this way, they would exhibit the spectacle of provisionally united Churches, not of the one Church which is the Body of Christ. A fatal contentment might ensue. It would be an improvement on

the present state of things, but in this case the better might be the enemy of the best, hindering the fulfilment of God's purpose in Christ.

For those who judge the continuance of this state of things intolerable, there are two ways of regarding it. The first is to satisfy oneself that the whole Church is to be found in one section of divided Christendom, or in certain sections taken together, and to place all other sections beyond the pale. That is difficult, because the evidences of spiritual life in Christ, lived on the outer side of any pale that can be reasonably suggested, are too patent to be ignored. An escape from the difficulty may be sought in a comforting assurance that those who so live belong to a disembodied Soul of the Church. But that, as I have shown, reduces to absurdity the whole doctrine of the mystical Body of Christ, and makes any healing of the wounds in the Body superfluous; it is at best an attempt to keep the Unity of the Spirit without the Bond of Peace. The other way is to regard all sections as belonging presumably to the Body, still linked together, however imperfectly, in the Unity of the Spirit, and to labour for the perfecting

of that union by a restoration, however distant, of the Bond of Peace.

It is impossible to forecast the manner of such restoration. We may be sure that it will have to take the form of Intercommunion, for nothing else will give the completeness of the Body of Christ; but the conditions of Intercommunion remain to be explored. I have shown that, in the past, renewal of Communion did not always come on the exact lines mapped out by theological speculation. The wind of the Spirit blew where it listed, not where men had laid out its course. So it will probably be in the future.

It is therefore no part of my task to indicate any procedure. All of us who care for these things probably have dreams, and we are not likely to wake in this world, either to an amazing fulfilment of them, or to the joyous disappointment of seeing the work of God achieved in a way that is not our own. Two things only I will venture to say. If two sections only of Christendom are brought together in Communion, it will be something done. If anything short of the whole work be the limit of our endeavour, we shall be hindering even the part of it which lies nearest to our hands.

# APPENDIX

## MINIMUM CONDITIONS OF INTERCOMMUNION

*Discussed in two articles which appeared in the Church Quarterly Review of January 1923*

### I

THE connexion between the unity of the Christian Church and a common participation of the Lord's Table is sufficiently obvious. St. Paul put it at the highest when he wrote to the Corinthians, "Since there is one bread, we being many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread." But we are not to infer that this common participation makes us one. That is effected rather by the one baptism, and by the bond of peace in which we labour to maintain the unity of the Spirit. The Eucharist is but one element in that endeavour, and the common participation is rather a consequence than a cause of our unity, as it is also a public manifestation thereof. The Eucharist is not happily called, as in a well-known hymn, the "sacrament of unity"; for in the language of St. Cyprian, from whom the phrase was borrowed, the episcopate is the *sacramentum unitatis*, holding

together in one society the members of the Church resident in a certain place, and also holding together by mutual intercourse the groups of Christians dispersed throughout the world. This episcopate has fallen away from Cyprian's ideal, and the Eucharist cannot be said to have taken its place; both, indeed, have developed divisive tendencies. It is only when these tendencies have been overcome that union can be achieved. But it remains true that union is not achieved until Christians can meet together without hindrance at the Lord's Table.

It is of considerable importance, therefore, to consider what are the necessary conditions of common participation; and in the present divided state of Christendom each group has to consider this apart. If proposals of union are made to us, or by us to others, one thing that must be determined is the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper. That complete uniformity should be required is out of the question. There never has been such uniformity, and it is not desirable. But some details of the celebration are necessary, and some others are so expedient that we have no right to dispense with them. There must be bread and wine and an appropriate benediction. To use the words of St. Paul, the bread which we break and the cup which we bless are of the essence of the Eucharist. But more than these bare elements must be required. To quote St. Paul again, things must be done decently and in order. This may be illustrated by an incident which has occurred

within my knowledge. Many years ago, a priest who found himself on a Sunday in a remote Alpine inn, far away from any church, procured a plate and a glass, some bread and some wine, and went out with two companions into the mountains, where in his rough tweed suit he celebrated the Holy Communion, a flat rock serving for an altar ; the plate and the glass, to prevent their return to profane uses, were afterwards thrown into a deep lake. Whatever we may think of the legitimacy of this, it was unquestionably a valid sacramental act, and I have no doubt that it was done with the utmost reverence and devotion ; but I think we should not entertain proposals of union with people who would normally celebrate the Lord's Supper in such a fashion. We should consider it lacking in decency.

No proposals of union are at present being urged, but there are some that we may have in view as possible, and it is well to consider among ourselves some things that we should have to press if these proposals were made.

In the first place, there is the material of the sacrament to be considered. We shall not follow the bad example of some Greeks in the eleventh century and insist on either leavened or unleavened bread ; but must we insist on wheaten bread ? The question is not urgent here in England, where nothing else is likely to be used ; but one has heard of bread-fruit or rice-cakes or cassava-bread being put forward as a sufficient substitute in tropical missions. The plea that " bread " means

the ordinary diet of the people, consecrated to this excellent mystery, is not to be despised. Neither can we set aside, without good reason, the argument that loaves of barley were commonly used in the days of the Gospel, and that our Lord may possibly have instituted the Eucharist in such bread. But there is a reason for the exclusive use of wheaten bread which seems to me irresistible. It has been required with insistence throughout the history of the Church, and there seems to be no evidence of any other material being allowed. There is, indeed, a strong current of opinion, to say no more, that nothing else will suffice. In face of this, innovation does not seem to be permissible. The excellent principle known as tutiorism demands the use of that which is certainly known to be sufficient, and the exclusion of that about which there may be a doubt.

The cup must contain wine. I think there is no dispute about this anywhere. The *Aquarii* of the third and fourth centuries were mere eccentrics, who effected no lodgment in the Catholic Church. But a definition may be needed. Tropical missions, again, are said to have used something called "date-wine," as being the only thing of the kind easily procured. But what our Lord blessed was "the fruit of the vine," and we have no right to tolerate anything else. There may be more difficulty about what is called "unfermented wine." There are precedents for the use of freshly expressed grape juice, which is acknowledged to be sufficient. But this cannot be procured except at the time of vintage,

and it seems to be established that the expressed juice cannot be prevented from fermenting except by an application of heat or an admixture of chemicals which will have the effect of denaturing it, so that it can no longer properly be called wine. The use of natural wine seems to be obligatory.

These elements must be blessed. There are three records of the institution : that of St. Mark, reproduced almost exactly in St. Matthew ; that of St. Paul ; and the rather confused account given by St. Luke. In the first the two conceptions of blessing (εὐλογεῖν) and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστεῖν) are prominent, the one being applied to the bread and the other to the cup. St. Paul speaks only of thanksgiving in relation to the bread, and describes the cup as treated " in like manner " (ὡσαύτως) ; but he supplements this in a neighbouring passage by a reference to " the cup of blessing which we bless." St. Luke mentions only thanksgiving. All three speak also with emphasis of the breaking of the bread. This connexion of blessing and thanksgiving, together with the breaking of the bread, has been constant in the practice of the Church. It is secured by the incorporation of the blessing of the bread and wine into a prayer of thanksgiving normally introduced by the greeting " Lift up your hearts " or its equivalent. The recitation of a record of the institution, with or without amplification, precedes or follows the blessing ; and the breaking of the bread, with more or less of solemnity, follows in sufficiently close connexion.

So much of detail seems to be indispensable, and no more. We must certainly require a decent measure of solemnity, but we cannot regulate the particulars ; they have varied widely in the practice of the Church, and even greater variations may be tolerable. We may ourselves highly value the assumption of a special vesture by the celebrant, but in view of the known practice of the first three or four Christian centuries we cannot pretend that anything of the kind is necessary. We do value very highly the liturgical framework in which the essential act has been enshrined, the sequence of prayers and lections and hymns ; but these have been, and are, too various in the practice of the Church to be regarded as even approximately essential. We may blame those who depart very far in these particulars from the tradition which we have received, but we can hardly, on that account alone, refuse intercommunion with them. We may value still more the possession of set forms for the rendering of the essential act itself, such as that which is significantly called in the Roman rite the *Canon* of the Mass ; but we must remember that more than three hundred years elapsed before such set forms were firmly established, during which the celebrant enjoyed a gradually diminishing freedom to fill up the bare outline of the Eucharistic prayer at his discretion. We may blame those who hark back to this dangerous freedom, which experience taught the Church to circumscribe ; but it is a long step from such blame to a refusal of communion.

I set aside all questions of doctrine, or of practice

regarded as bearing witness to doctrine. Orthodoxy, a right judgment in respect of faith and morality, should certainly be made a condition of intercommunion ; but I am dealing only with one department of practice in the Christian religion, and I assume the orthodoxy of any whose case has to be considered. There remains, however, one question which is intimately connected with doctrine, and not easily disentangled. But it is possible to treat it from the standpoint of practice, and this I shall try to do.

The Eucharist must be celebrated in a certain way. By whom ? It is the question that most of all provokes antagonism. It must be faced.

The analogy of baptism may suggest that any Christian is capable of doing this. It is agreed that he can baptize ; that in case of emergency he ought to baptize. In controversy with the Donatists, St. Augustine established the principle that heretics and schismatics, no less than Catholic Christians, have this power ; if what Christ commanded is done, the purpose of Christ is effected. The Western Church followed St. Augustine without reserve ; the Eastern Churches have never adopted the whole of his teaching in principle, but they act upon it by what is called "economy."

Why should not the sacrament of the Lord's Supper come under this rule ? If it does, consider the case of those young Methodist soldiers, heard of during the war, who got some bread and wine in the trench, and with simple piety recalling the liturgical words partook thereof. They would

make not only a good spiritual communion—that we cannot doubt—but also a sacramental communion. One would like to believe it. I do not know how to prove the negative. But could we act on this supposition as a basis of intercommunion? Could we enter into union with a group of Christians having no ordered ministry for this purpose, and recognizing the right of any individual member so to act?

For lack of evidence we cannot say positively that any such ministry existed in the days of the Apostles. In the canonical books of the New Testament there is nothing inconsistent with the hypothesis that any member of the Church was competent to bless the Eucharist. There is evidence of an ordered ministry, but there is nothing to show that this function was reserved to that ministry. Neither is there anything inconsistent with such reservation. St. Paul asks of one speaking with a "tongue," and therefore unintelligibly to many of those present: "If thou bless with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the ungifted say the Amen at thy thanksgiving?" He is probably referring to the Eucharistic function, and he certainly seems to be addressing all and sundry; but this cannot be affirmed with any confidence. If the function were reserved, we might expect to find it mentioned among the spiritual gifts which St. Paul more than once enumerates, and still more probably in the Pastoral Epistles; but, on the other hand, it may have belonged so obviously to the part of the pastor, episcopus, or presbyter

presiding in the assembly—as Justin Martyr was to put it a hundred years later—that no special mention of it was required. We can only say, in sum, that no evidence is available from the Apostolic age. But it soon begins to accumulate.

We have the explicit statement of St. Ignatius [1] that no Eucharist is valid (*βεβαία*) except that which is celebrated by the bishop or his delegate. The nature of this delegation does not yet appear, but by the end of the second century there is sufficient evidence to show that in the Catholic Church the only substitute for the bishop is a presbyter. Tertullian had passed over to Montanism when he said that in the absence of bishop or presbyter a layman could minister any sacrament, and the special characteristics of Montanism underlie the remark. From this time onward a uniform practice prevails. Orthodox Christians and heretics agree in it. Only in the most eccentric and obscure sects is there any variation.

It should be observed that this strict reservation of the Eucharistic function to bishops and presbyters does not necessarily imply that others have not the power of blessing. It may have been so determined only on the ground of discipline. There was a like reservation of the ministry of baptism, but with an important difference. In the case of baptism, which has an abiding effect and may not be repeated, it was necessary to decide whether an irregular ministration of the sacrament was effective. This being affirmed, the toleration, and even the

[1] *Smyrn.* 3.

allowance, of baptism by a layman in times of emergency followed from the assumption of its supreme necessity. But in the case of the Eucharist no question of this kind could arise, and it has never been the custom of the Church to determine questions except where a solution is practically and urgently required. For the moment we may leave the reservation as a matter of discipline.

On the same footing we may put the rule that a man can become bishop or presbyter only by ordination at the hands of a bishop. For many centuries there is but one outstanding exception, whether in the Catholic Church or among heretics. Documents of the third century, commonly known as the Canons of Hippolytus and the Church Orders, say that a man who has stood firm in persecution, surviving imprisonment or torture, may be ranked immediately in the presbyterate ; his confession is equivalent to ordination. Other texts reduce the privilege, giving the confessor only a special right to be ordained. There is no further evidence, and it is a suspicious circumstance that the correspondence of St. Cyprian, which deals largely with the ambitions and the occasional insubordination of the confessors, affords no hint of any such privilege. It is of theoretic interest, indicating that the requirement of ordination may be rather disciplinary than doctrinal ; but it is doubtful and of no practical importance. Other apparent exceptions to the rule have not stood the test of historical criticism.

Theoretic also is the question whether presbyters, equally with bishops, have the power of ordaining.

It has been debated since the days of St. Jerome. The affirmation is supported by the practice which joins them with the bishop in the imposition of hands, by the apparent identification of the two titles in the writings of the first century, and by the strong current of theological opinion which refuses to recognize the episcopate as a distinct order in the sacred ministry. But in practice there is no trace of ordination by presbyters without a bishop, until it was undertaken perhaps by the Waldensians of the thirteenth century, certainly by Protestants and Reformed in the sixteenth century. Therefore, in accordance with the principle of tutiorism already mentioned, it seems to me impossible to accept such ordination as sufficient.

The conclusion is that we have no right to enter into communion with any group of Christians who allow the celebration of the Lord's Supper by one who has not received ordination at the hands of a bishop. There are some things in respect of which innovation is not permissible without the general consent of the whole Church ; and this, I should say, is one of them.

I have tried to put these requirements at the lowest. To insist on anything which may hinder the union of Christians is to assume a grave responsibility. Nothing, therefore, should be pressed which does not seem to be of strict obligation. I have tried to ascertain what we must regard as obligatory in connexion with a sacrament of which all the members of a united Church should be able to participate without hindrance and without hesitation.

T. A. Lacey.

# CONDITIONS OF INTERCOMMUNION

## II

I welcome the opportunity to define my relation to the minimum conditions of intercommunion at the Lord's Table between those of episcopal and non-episcopal traditions, laid down so moderately by Canon Lacey. For by so doing I hope to be able to show, first, how far Evangelical Protestants who have caught something of the vision of Catholic or all-inclusive Christian Unity in the Church, as it inspires the Lambeth Appeal, can already go conscientiously to meet such an approach from the Anglo-Catholic side ; and next, what positive and constructive elements in their faith towards God and their loyalty to " the mind of Christ " have still to be satisfied, ere they can whole-heartedly clasp hands in a concordat that shall exemplify that " mutual deference to one another's consciences " which is one of the notes of true Christian love and the recognition of which helps to make that appeal so epoch-making. Our two papers, then, will afford a contrast in perspective, or in relative emphasis on religious values which probably both of us recognize to some degree as having a rightful place in the full Christian Gospel, when applied to the changing conditions of historical Christianity.

Mr. Lacey's very first paragraph affords a case of such contrasted emphasis. In urging, quite rightly, that " common participation of the Lord's Table " is an effect, before it is an enhancing cause, of Christian unity, he goes on to say that we

are made one " rather by the one baptism, and by the bond of peace in which we labour to maintain the unity of the Spirit. The Eucharist is but one element in that endeavour." Now I should say that the true Biblical emphasis would rather be, " by the one Lord, and one faith " in Him as such—of which the rite of baptism in His Name is the overt Church symbol—and by the experience of the Spirit-baptism, which it was and is our Lord's special prerogative to mediate to us. The one Lordship and the one Spirit-consciousness of unity in Christ, the Head of the Body, is that which gives meaning and reality alike to the one baptism and the breaking of the one Bread of Thanksgiving or Eucharist. And the same Biblical emphasis would lead me to regard the Eucharist as entitled, according to Christ's teaching and values, to be styled the " sacrament of unity " in the every-day life of the Christian Society, rather than the episcopate, as the human ministry of Christ's sacrament of union with Himself and with fellow-members of His mystic Body. The other emphasis is Cyprian's, as Mr. Lacey reminds us ; but the Evangelical Churchman always aims consciously at going behind a disciple's emphasis, and even that of the majority of Christ's disciples in the past, to that of the Master.

The episcopate, even that rather late organ of more comprehensive unity, the diocesan episcopate —an episcopate over bishops of the primitive type —can well be allowed a high value as " holding together in one society the members of the Church

resident in a certain place, and also holding together by mutual intercourse the groups of Christians dispersed throughout the world." But at best it is a relative value, measured by Christ's own emphasis, or rather lack of emphasis, on matters moving in the sphere of organization, and so by the standards of Evangelical Christianity. Next, when Mr. Lacey goes on to say "the Episcopate has fallen away from Cyprian's ideal, and the Eucharist cannot be said to have taken its place : both, indeed, have developed divisive tendencies," one can only echo "Amen." Further, if one asks Why? the answer that occurs to me is the old one of a wrong perspective or emphasis, which subordinates "one faith" in the "one Lord" to its sacramental or institutional expression, in Eucharist or Episcopate, and the grace supposed to be inherent in these *per se* through a certain line of celebration or succession. In any case "it is only when those divisive tendencies" in what are in idea means to unity "have been overcome, that union can be achieved. But it remains true that union is not achieved until Christians can meet together without hindrance at the Lord's Table." On what conditions, then, can this come about?

1.

The first thing "that must be determined is the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper." Here Mr. Lacey at once sets aside the notion of complete uniformity. "But some details" of mode "are necessary, and some others are so

expedient that we have no right to dispense with them." This latter class will be the real crux of the problem : for about the essentials, as he goes on to state them, there need be little difficulty. " Bread and wine and an appropriate benediction," these are the simple requisites according to the Master's own example ; in other words, appropriate symbols and a form of benediction giving them their sacramental meaning for faith. I put it so, because it seems to me that this sets in its true light and perspective the casuistry touching the exact kind of " bread " or daily food (as " the loaf " was to Jesus and His circle) which Mr. Lacey raises *à propos* of the possible use of " bread-fruit or rice-cakes or cassava-bread " on various mission fields. Who can doubt that Jesus would have used any one of these, instead of the wheaten or barley loaf He actually used, had it been the staple form of " the bread of life " on the table before Him in the upper chamber ? I cannot, then, concur that virtually uniform adherence to the use of wheaten bread in the known past of the Church, until quite recent times, must needs exclude the use of other forms of bread-food where the former is unobtainable or so hard to obtain as to hinder the free celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Table. The consideration of solidarity of feeling with the whole Church, in space and time, should enter in very largely, so as to make all Christians use every reasonable effort to preserve this psychological link of unity in worship with the Church Catholic. But it is pushing " the excellent principle known as

tutiorism," or greater security, too far, to employ it to "demand the exclusion of that (material element) about which there may be a doubt." That is to demand a right for "weak" consciences to bring into bondage those "strong" in "faith," or assured conviction as to their Lord's approval, in the face of Paul's ruling to the contrary in Romans xiv. All that the "weak" in such a case are entitled to ask for is the reciprocal application of Christ's law of Love, their scruples not being "judged" uncharitably by those so using their own "liberty in the Lord," but on the contrary being considered, as far as possible, when they themselves are present and wishful to communicate. To go beyond this, as Mr. Lacey suggests, would be to turn "tutiorism" into a new "legalism," much after the manner of those Jewish Christians, with very real traditional scruples based on a Divine Law not formally set aside by Christ, who demanded that certain sacred dietary rules should be observed in table-fellowship even by their Gentile brethren in Christ. In both cases fidelity to the letter of precedent and usage, pleading its own as "the safer way," is in fact made to over-ride the liberty of the Spirit in loyalty to the Lord's intention, expressed originally under particular conditions only, according to the contingency of all things human. So long as the symbolism is adequately preserved, so long is the liberty of the Christian spirit within its rights in applying its Lord's mind, *mutatis mutandis*, to fresh conditions.

The above principle of due maintenance of the

symbolism of a sacramental element, which is the Evangelic rather than legal type of fidelity in such matters, bears also upon the casuistry of the Cup. This Mr. Lacey discusses as regards the use, on the one hand, of unfermented wine—which is no less fitly symbolic than fermented—and, on the other, of water, which as obviously sacrifices an essential element in the symbolism, viz. visible similarity of "the blood of the vine" to that of the human body,[1] itself the vehicle of bodily life. Thus only on the principle of a ritual legalism alien to the spirit of Christ and His Gospel could one conclude that "the use of natural wine seems to be obligatory." But, after all, such cases of conscience as to the elements of the Eucharist are of little real practical moment for our present purpose, save as also raising the main issues of standpoint and emphasis which emerge more directly in the weightier matters yet to be discussed.

As to the essential nature of Benediction of the elements with Prayer, there is in principle nothing of moment in Mr. Lacey's statement which I cannot heartily accept: and I am glad that he limits the "indispensable" under this head to so little. He has strong feelings as to "the pity of it," that many depart so far in certain particulars from the Catholic liturgic tradition. But he faces honestly and bravely the facts of the variety and gradual development of the various "Catholic"

[1] On no valid sacramental theory, Catholic or Protestant, can one uphold Canon Lacey's objection to the "denatured" state of unfermented wine.

liturgical types, in view of the "more than three hundred years before such set forms were firmly established, during which the celebrant enjoyed a gradually diminishing freedom to fill up the bare outline of the Eucharistic prayer at his discretion." For himself he seems to sympathize with those who "blame those who hark back to this dangerous freedom, which experience taught the Church to circumscribe." Personally I cannot imagine such a sentiment falling from the lips of the Church's Lord, the Christ of the Gospels. But in any case that feeling (which the Lambeth Appeal does not appear quite to share) does not in Mr. Lacey's eyes warrant "a refusal of communion" to those who do not think circumscription of freedom in religious expression (including freedom to use *all* the fruits of the Church's growing experience in such devotional expression) a desirable form of Christian development, but the opposite. And so, as representing those communions which are free in principle and in practice to use all the garnered wealth of the Church's past in their Eucharistic ministry, I am well content that Mr. Lacey here goes as far as he does in Eucharistic toleration, on that ground of "mutual deference to one another's consciences" which the Lambeth Appeal rightly points to as that wherein we must find "the bond of peace" in unity amid variety.

2.

The next question is, By whom must the Eucharist be administered? Canon Lacey rightly

begins by facing " the analogy of baptism," which " may suggest that any Christian is capable of doing this. It is agreed that he can baptize ; that in case of emergency he ought to baptize." And in spite of all that he urges in the negative, I cannot see why, not only on Christ's own teaching as to the nature of ministry among His disciples, but also in reason and sound Church theory, the Lord's Supper should not come under the rule followed by the Church, particularly the Western Church, in the case of baptism. As confirming this view, namely that the validity of " heretical " or " schismatical " baptism and Eucharist stands and falls together, it is pertinent to cite the remarkably thoroughgoing way in which the Report of the Constantinople 1920 Delegation to Lambeth made to " The Most Reverend and Holy Synod " of Constantinople, and officially published in September 1921 (English translation in *The Christian East*, vol. iii., No. 1, S.P.C.K.), refuses to accept the validity even of " Baptism administered by English (i.e. Anglican) priests." The question is not, as Mr. Lacey puts it, " Could we (Anglicans) enter into union with a group of Christians having no ordered ministry for the purpose, and recognizing the right of any individual member so to act ? " It is whether Mr. Lacey and his friends can enter into union with a group of Christians having an ordered ministry, regularly commissioned to perform the Eucharist, and other acts of a representative character, as the appointed organ of the group's corporate life as a part of the Church of

Christ, yet acting under a commission not given through a bishop in the Catholic sense.

Relative to this question, Mr. Lacey's discussion touching the existence of a prophetic freedom for Eucharistic prayer by any member of an apostolic church, at the date when Paul wrote 1 Cor. xiv, and probably for a good time after in certain regions at least, is almost superfluous.[1] It is enough for our common purpose to consider the Eucharistic ministry expressing the corporate authority of a church-group, and the question whether "non-episcopal" churches to-day possess any such ministry. Here I submit, with all possible emphasis, that they *do*, in essentially the sense emphasized by Ignatius, the great exponent of high claims for the primitive type of bishop or local church pastor—a congregational bishop, in fact, and no more (save as regards the civil or territorial area from which his congregation was gathered). He dwells upon the divinely approved office of the one bishop as the centre of unity in the one flock with which he stands in habitual personal relations, and as its natural link of practical unity with sister local churches of the Church universal.[2] Nowhere

[1] My own judgment on the historical question is that his *non liquet* verdict, "We can only say, in sum, that no evidence is available from the Apostolic age," clear enough to settle it, is altogether too cautious, even on the data as most fairly presented by Canon Lacey himself.

[2] This was the only other essential unit of corporate life in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic ages. There were no such officers as bishops in the sense of "episcopacy" to-day, viz. diocesan episcopacy of the mediaeval type.

does Ignatius connect the authority of a bishop, for the ministry either of the Word or of Sacraments, with ordination. He regards each bishop as divinely chosen by God, who bestows the necessary personal gifts as He will ; the Church's part is that of spiritual recognition of God's manifest choice in the above sense, a recognition which seems at that date to have taken effect in "appointment" (cf. 1 Clem. 44) by the natural leaders and representatives of its corporate consciousness, its official "Elders" or presbyters. As thus empowered by Divine gift and calling from above, and by the Church's commission ratifying it among men, the local chief pastor or bishop was the normal organ of each church's Eucharistic prayer, unless need arose for him to act by deputy through one of his colleagues in the presbyteral order. This would occur with a frequency proportionate to the increase of the local or city church under a single presiding presbyter or "president," as Justin Martyr styles a bishop. But in all the above, when we look behind names to things, as the historian must ever do, there is nothing as yet which goes beyond essential congregationalism, and its type of episcopate and pastoral commission. Nor even when the participation of neighbouring congregational bishops in the solemn institution or ordination of a bishop by and in a sister church became a regular custom, was this alien to the ideal of modern Congregationalism, any more than of Presbyterianism or Methodism, so long as that participation was not "as of necessity," but as

symbol of the spiritual solidarity of the Church Catholic.

When, again, Mr. Lacey observes that "strict reservation of the Eucharistic function to bishops and presbyters," in the early second century sense of the distinction between the two offices, "does not necessarily imply that others have not the power of blessing," I gladly echo his words. "It may have been determined only on the ground of discipline": and on that ground most non-episcopalians are willing to adhere to the restriction in normal cases, each according to their own modern equivalent offices for "bishop" and "presbyter." But when he goes on to allege a contrast in this matter between baptism and Eucharist respectively, they would demur. We must deny Scriptural and really primitive warrant to the distinction drawn, on the score of the "supreme necessity" of the former as compared with the latter. So far as both rites are corporate acts covered by a commission at all, anyone surely requires as representative an authorization to perform the more definitely decisive sacramental act of baptism as to perform the less crucial act of Eucharistic ministry. If irregularity or defect in the ecclesiastical status of Christ's minister in baptism (especially on the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of baptismal re-birth) does not render the efficacy of the sacrament precarious, if only the form and matter be correct, it is inconsistent to regard and treat as precarious or "invalid" a Eucharist administered in due form (as Mr. Lacey himself defines it), and in good faith, simply because

the ecclesiastical commission under which a minister functions lacks the relatively late method of Catholic episcopal ordination. The distinction which Catholicism, especially in the West, has here drawn since the middle of the third century does not seem one which the Church is authorized to add "as a matter of discipline" to the teaching of its Lord and of His Apostles on the subject.

Finally, it is on the same footing, i.e. "a matter of discipline" in the Catholic Church, that Mr. Lacey is content to put "the rule that a man can become bishop or presbyter only by ordination at the hands of a bishop." As already argued, there is really a deep ambiguity in the use of terms here. The real issue is whether the meaning of the term "bishop" proper to Catholicism only after the second or third century, and in some ways far later, is to oust from recognition as authorized ministers for the Churchly acts of Eucharist and ordination, those pastors or "bishops" (of the Ignatian type) who have not been ordained episcopally in the later sense, but only in the earlier. For this latter is claimed to be true of all regular ministries to-day of the Congregational and Presbyterian variety. Here there is no need for going into any doubtful disputation about the bearing of the earliest "Church Orders" (of the third and fourth centuries)—as to which the last word has not yet been said. But one must firmly question Mr. Lacey's broad assertion that "in practice there is no trace of ordination by presbyters without a bishop" in the ancient Church. Bishop John

Wordsworth, in his *Ministry of Grace*, and many other Anglican scholars have held and still hold the opposite view. However, as Mr. Lacey puts forward his *non possumus* against accepting non-episcopal ordination (in his sense, not the Ignatian) as sufficient, on the score simply of church discipline during the bulk of the Catholic centuries, one is really confronted with nothing more than the principle of high expediency. Anglicans, he concludes, "have no right" to depart from the now immemorial Catholic discipline on so important a matter "without the general consent of the whole Church." I take it that this means the whole episcopally organized Church, including the Roman branch, with its radical innovations, the Papacy, according to Eastern and Anglican standards of Catholic discipline. Going back, then, as Evangelical Christians are bound to do, behind the one or the other historically developed and therefore relative discipline, to the only absolute authority in Christianity, the Church's Head, as reflected in the Gospels and the Apostolic writings, one must reply that Anglicans "have no right" to lay down any condition of intercommunion between themselves and the disciples of the One Lord, theirs and ours, additional to those which He himself has personally authorized. That is a far more serious "innovation" in principle than any breach of formal or institutional continuity which may mar the historic solidarity of modern non-episcopal Church groups with groups which have retained the later Catholic type of episcopate. It is, too,

surely a most grave and significant fact that the common retention of this type of ministerial office has not saved the episcopal groups from mutual schism, even at the Lord's Table; whereas the non-episcopal groups enjoy mutual communion with each other, and would fain extend this to the episcopal also.

Accordingly we submit that, in order to secure a more truly Catholic communion, we must all, Anglicans and others alike, lay more stress upon unity in the Gospel of Christ, a unity rooted in loyalty of faith and obedience towards Christ as Lord, because God manifest in a human personality, than upon anything so *religiously* relative and secondary as any particular historical form of the Church's ministry. In this sphere we hold that nothing can, according to the mind of Christ, be "of strict obligation." Nevertheless, in order that "all the members" of Christ should be able outwardly, as well as inwardly, "to participate without hindrance and without hesitation" in the one Lord's Table, the non-episcopal groups might consent, as an act of loving deference for the traditional Catholic conscience in their brethren, to mutual re-commissioning *relative to a greater approximation to a truly Catholic Church*, if only it were really mutual in the deference shown to conscience on both sides.

VERNON BARTLET.

# NOTES

## NOTE A

### *Συναγωγή. Ἐκκλησία.*

THE Hebrew words *ʿēdāh* and *ḳāhāl* mean the general assembly of the whole people. They are indiscriminately rendered in LXX by *συναγωγὴ* and *ἐκκλησία*. In Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, *συναγωγὴ* alone is used. In Deut. iv. 10, ix. 10 and xviii. 16 *ἐκκλησία* is the great assembly at Horeb; in xxiii. 1, 3 the sense of the same word seems to waver between the actual assembly and the people represented by the assembly. Elsewhere both words in both languages are found to be leaning decisively to the latter sense. In Neh. xiii. 1 the words of Deut. xxiii. are quoted without ambiguity (*ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ* being substituted for *ἐκκλησία κυρίου*) in this sense, for immediately below the phrase is treated as equivalent to *Israel*. In 2 Esdras x. 8 *ἐκκλησία τῆς ἀποικίας* is used in a similar connexion, and clearly means the community of the returned exiles. In Neh. vii. 66 and 2 Esdras ii. 64, *πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία* means the whole number, 42,360, of that community. In Ps. lxxiv (LXX, lxxiii), which is of Maccabean date, *ʿēdāh*, *συναγωγὴ*, cannot be understood of anything but the whole stock of Israel. It is interesting

to observe that in Acts xx. 28, where there seems to be an echo of these words, St. Paul, or his reporter, substitutes *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ* for *τῆς συναγωγῆς σου*.

The interchangeableness of *συναγωγὴ* and *ἐκκλησία* is illustrated by the two phrases *ἐξεκκλησιάσθη ἡ συναγωγή*, Judges xx. 1, and *συναγάγετε ἐκκλησίαν*, Joel ii. 16, where the Hebrew substantive in both cases is *ḳāhāl*, and the verbs are different.

In Sirach xxiv. 23, where the law is called *κληρονομία συναγωγαῖς Ἰακὼβ*, there may be an approach to the later meaning of the word, the *synagogue* of the New Testament.

Professor Burkitt has been good enough to supply me with the following information, remote from my own knowledge :—

"In Aramaic a synagogue is *knīshtā*, in Rabbinical Hebrew *knéseth*. These are the congregation itself; the *place* of meeting is *bē knīshtā* or *beth* (*ha*)-*késeth*. In Christian Palestinian Aramaic *ḳhālā* (which is equivalent to *ḳāhāl*) has come to mean the *people* (*λαός*), while *ἐκκλησία* is represented by *knīshtā*. In Edessene (i.e. Christian classical Syriac) the Christian *ἐκκλησία* is *'ēdtā*, which is grammatically equivalent to Hebrew *'ēdāh*, and the Jewish *συναγωγὴ* is *knashtā*. But *'ēdtā* seems to be an afterthought, for the Sinai Syriac has *knushtā* in Matt. xviii. 17 (where Cureton's MS. and the Peshitta have *'ēdtā*), and in Acts vii. 38 even the Peshitta has *knushtā*. In Matt. xvi. 18, which is missing from the Sinai MS., both Cureton and Peshitta have *'ēdath*, i.e. *my 'ēdtā*.

"*'Edtā* is also used for 'assembly' or 'congregation' in the Syriac Old Testament. Apparently its appropriation to the Church was the appropriation of an existing word as in the case of *ἐκκλησία*."

It seems to me, thus instructed, that the Syriac *'ēdtā* is an archaism corresponding exactly to that which I find in the Christian use of ἐκκλησία, but that the Palestinian Christians felt no need of such a distinctive term, and were content to go on using the vernacular style of the Synagogue. Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.*, I. ii. 18) says, in his clumsy way, that the Ebionites συναγωγὴν καλοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχι ἐκκλησίαν. To this practice may be due συναγωγὴ in James ii. 2; but in v. 14 ἐκκλησία is used.

## NOTE B

## CHURCH AND CHURCHES

In the history of our English word *Kirk* or *Church* there seems to be an inversion of the process which I suppose in the case of the word *ecclesia*. The most probable account of it, for which see the *New English Dictionary*, is that barbarian invaders of the Eastern Empire became acquainted with the word κυριακὸν, which from the beginning of the fourth century is found in use for a building devoted to Christian worship, and adopted it with inevitable phonetic changes in their own languages. It would then stand for any external Christian institution, and they seem to have stretched it, when evangelized, to all uses of the Greek or Latin word *ecclesia*. It is so used, with phonetic variations, in all Germanic and Slavonic languages, except Polish. The Gothic New Testament of Ulphilas has the word *aikklésjô*, transliterated from ἐκκλησία, but this evidently obtained no vogue.

## NOTE C

### *Μέλος. Σῶμα.*

*Μέλος* is a part of any articulate whole, especially an animal body, a strain of music, or a poetical composition. It is frequently associated with *μέρος*, as in 1 Cor. xii. 27, *μέλη ἐκ μέρους*, and the two words are possibly no more than phonetic variations.

*Σῶμα* is anything in mass or bulk ; in Homer, a *carcase* ; in Hesiod and later writers, also a living body. In Pindar, Fr. 96, *σῶμα* is a living man, *εἴδωλον* a wraith of the dead. Plato in the *Phaedo* opposes the human *σῶμα* to the *ψυχή*, making the body alternately a prison in which the soul is detained or an instrument used by the soul for the lowest kind of knowledge, the cognition of sensible phenomena. Hence a disparagement of the body, as of matter generally, which had extensive consequences. Later, however, in the *Phaedrus*, 245E, he distinguished between *σῶμα ἔμψυχον*, a living body which moves itself, and *σῶμα ἄψυχον*, a lifeless body which is moved from without. In the *Timaeus*, 30, he pictures the whole created world as a *ζῶον ἔμψυχον*, the visible, solid, and palpable *σῶμα τοῦ παντὸς* or *τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα*, which came to play an important part in the Stoic philosophy.

Some minor uses may be noted. The verb *σωματοποιεῖν* means to strengthen, but Polybius, ii. 45, 6, uses it of uniting tribes into a single nation. Similarly a gathering of literary works into a single volume is *σῶμα*. So Cicero, *ad Att.*, ii. 1, describes a collection of his speeches, but perhaps he used the Greek word jestingly, as equivalent to the Latin *corpus*, which was common in that sense. The

influence of the Latin word made itself felt, and in the Greek text of the Pandects σωματεῖον is used of an incorporated society; but this use seems to be unknown in genuine Greek literature.

In reaction from the Platonic idealism σῶμα came to stand for that which is *real*, or firmly established. Aristotle at the beginning of his *Rhetoric* describes the argument which he calls *enthymeme* as σῶμα τῆς πίστεως, the basis of persuasion. In this sense σῶμα is opposed to σκιὰ in Col. ii. 17; σωματικῶς in verse 9 means *in reality*, and in verse 11 τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς may be understood of the mass and weight of fleshly habits. Compare τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου in Rom. vii. 24. For the Stoics, everything that really exists is σῶμα, as contrasted with φαντασία. Their doctrine should not be called materialism, for in every σῶμα up to the all-including σῶμα τοῦ κόσμου they recognized a passive principle τὸ πάσχον, which is ὑλή, and an active principle τὸ ποιοῦν, which they identified with τὸ πνεῦμα διῆκον δι' ὅλου κόσμου, or more simply τὸ τοῦ κόσμου πνεῦμα (compare 1 Cor. ii. 12), of which the human spirit is a part. Observe that the Stoics prefer πνεῦμα to ψυχὴ in this sense.

St. Paul's acquaintance with Stoic language is not in doubt. Indeed it had become in his day the common property of all moderately educated men, just as now we all chatter about evolution. Tarsus, his own home, was a stronghold of the school. But it may be doubted whether his rabbinical studies had left him time for more than a superficial examination of its teaching. His quotation at Athens, as reported in Acts xvii. 28, τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν, is from Aratus, one of the Stoics of Cilicia, but this was an echo of Ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν, in the great

Hymn of Cleanthes, the best known of all the Stoic writings, and the one which St. Paul would most naturally quote. Perhaps his reporter made a mistake.

## NOTE D

## THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

I have without hesitation quoted the Epistle to the Ephesians as dictated by St. Paul, not forgetting the questions raised about peculiarities of style and vocabulary, but reckoning them insufficient ground for any serious doubt concerning his authorship. It contains too much that is conspicuously his, and it is difficult to find anyone else capable of contributing the rest.

From St. Paul's hand we have only fragments of a vast correspondence, in which there would be room for considerable varieties of style. Ephesians differs in all respects from his familiar epistles to churches in which he was personally known. Its character can be inferred from the inscription. The words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* do not appear in the Vat. and Sinait. MSS., though they have been added by correctors. We know from St. Basil the Great, *Adv. Eunom.*, ii. 19, that before his day the commonly accepted reading had been *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. His words are *οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν*. The fanciful interpretation that he borrowed from Origen, "the saints who really exist," is intolerable, and there was clearly a *lacuna* after *οὖσι*. The probable explanation is that the epistle was an encyclical, and the names of the various churches to which it was

sent were to be inserted in this place. The only insertion surviving is *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, but Marcion is said to have circulated copies with *ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ*. Tertullian unkindly attributes this to his vanity, as an attempt to claim special information, but it is quite possible that he found in Pontus a copy so inscribed. Our Epistle is certainly not the one mentioned in Col. iv. 16, which would be of the same intimate kind as Colossians. The conclusion that it was an encyclical to the churches of Asia, like the earlier epistle "to the churches of Galatia," seems irresistible, and this formal character sufficiently accounts for peculiarities of style.

The addition of *πᾶσι* in Cod. Alex. (introduced also by a corrector into Sinait.) suggests that an attempt had been made to give the inscription a completely general character, *τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, but it may be merely an importation from Phil. i. 1.

My own impression is that the Epistle to Colossae (together with that to Laodicea) was written first, and that certain thoughts thrown out casually in it were afterwards elaborated in the encyclical. This seems more probable than the repetition of phrases from the encyclical in the more intimate letter. They were despatched together by Tychicus, but I am thinking of the order of composition.

## NOTE E

## THE SEED OF ABRAHAM

### Gal. iii. 16.

*Τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ λέγει, καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ*

*πόλλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός.*

St. Paul's exegesis of the phrase in Gen. xiii. 15–17, which to our judgment of such matters may seem intolerable, is of the rabbinical kind, and might be an effective weapon against the Judaizers among the Galatians. It is most important to remember that these men were themselves Christian believers, representing the most conservative elements of Jewish Messianism within the Church. He uses the interpretation in support of his contention that they, no less than Gentile converts, had to be gathered into the new Israel, the Faithful Remnant, by union with Jesus the Christ; and he uses it as positively and as confidently as if it were generally accepted and incontestable. If that were so, one would expect to find traces of it in Rabbinical literature, and I have asked Dr. Abrahams, the Reader in Talmudic at Cambridge, whether anything of the kind exists. He has been good enough to reply as follows :—

"Though I do not think that Gen. xiii. 15–17 was rabbinically interpreted quite in accordance with St. Paul's exegesis (and why should we not allow him to give an original *turn* to an accepted method?) yet, as Wetstein correctly indicates, there is another passage in Gen. iv. 25 where 'another seed' is referred to Ruth the Moabitess, progenitor of David, the progenitor again of the Messiah. In the Midrash (Genesis Rabba, section xxiii, and again section li) this seed is called the Messiah. Thus in the latter section of the Midrash on Gen. xix. 32, 'that we may preserve *seed* of our father' (where the seed is Moab, Gen. xix. 37), the Midrash has: 'It does not say in the text *son*, but *seed*; this is the seed that came from another

place [here Gen. iv. 25 *another* is alluded to], and who is this? King Messiah.' Hence, though St. Paul may have had no exact parallel for his treatment of Gen. xiii. 15–17, there is enough extant parallel to make his exegesis plausible to his contemporaries."

So Dr. Abrahams, and I think he throws some light on a curious text.

## NOTE F

## THE CHRISTIAN SACERDOTIUM

*Πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, λίθον ζῶντα, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτόν, ἔντιμον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε, οἶκος πνευματικὸς, ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν.* 1 Pet. ii. 4–9.

*Καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς.* Apoc. v. 10.

The words of St. Peter are echoes of the Old Testament (Exod. xix. 5–6; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18; Ps. cxviii. 22, cxxxv. 4; Isa. xxviii. 16, lxi. 6), and illustrate the claim of the Christian Church to the inheritance of Israel. They emphasize the hieratic character of the Church, as also does the song of the redeemed in the Apocalypse of John. The Church having this character, it seems obvious that the sacred ministry of the Church also is hieratic. Yet nowhere in the canonical books of the New Testament is the word *ἱερεὺς* used of any person engaged in the apostolic ministry. St. Paul does (Rom. xv. 16) speak of

the grace and mission given to him by God, in strictly hieratic terms: "*Εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος.*" But that is not quite the same thing as giving out that he is *ἱερεύς*, though the implication is irresistible.

A reason for the avoidance of the word has been suggested. In all Jewish communities the word *ἱερεύς* meant a man of the family of Aaron, and any other use of it would be misleading; for example, to apply it to Barnabas, who was a Levite, would be most confusing. The difficulty was felt by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews even in relation to our Lord, who on earth "*οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς, ὄντων τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ νόμον τὰ δῶρα.*" He turns the difficulty in two ways, by referring to Melchisedec as superior to Aaron, and by placing the hieratic action of Christ in heaven. The converse of this argument appears in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew; discussing the prediction of "false Christs and false prophets," he in one place substitutes *ἱερεῖς* for *ψευδόχριστοι*.

The same avoidance of the word is to be observed in the Epistle of Clement, where it is the more marked since he compares the Christian ministry with that of the Old Testament to the point of identification. One passage of Ignatius is doubtful: "*Καλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς, κρεῖσσον δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων* (Phil. ix. 1); *ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς* is certainly Christ, but it is not clear whether the *ἱερεῖς* compared with Him are those of the Old Testament or of the New.

The earliest Latin Christians do not seem to have felt any similar difficulty about the word *sacerdos*, perhaps because it had not been specially applied to the line of

Aaron, perhaps because the risk of confusion with Jewish institutions was past. Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 17) says that the Bishop as *summus sacerdos* is the proper minister of baptism, and presbyters or deacons may administer it with his approval; which seems to imply that any one of them is *sacerdos*. Cyprian uses the title only of bishops, to whom he constantly applies it; from the fourth century onward it is freely given to presbyters, and attached to them especially as ministers of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

Hence an etymological curiosity. Since the Christian *presbyter* was the only *sacerdos* commonly known, his proper designation, passing with phonetic variations into the national languages of western Christendom, acquired a secondary meaning drawn from this association of ideas; the Italian *prete*, the French *prêtre*, the English *priest*, the German *Priester*, is in those languages the only equivalent of ἱερεὺς or *sacerdos*, as well as of πρεσβύτερος or *presbyter*. To avoid equivocation, I have used the word *presbyter*, to a point where it becomes intolerably pedantic.

## NOTE G

## THE PAPACY

In sketching the development of the sacred ministry I have omitted all mention of the Papacy, not because I think it negligible, but because it does not seem to be an integral part of that function. The special authority claimed for the Pope, though the Vatican Council says that it is *vere episcopalis*, appears to be not so much in the hierarchy as over the hierarchy.

At the end of the fourth century, says Duchesne (*Histoire*

*ancienne de l'Église*, tome. ii. p. 660), "La Papauté, telle que l'Occident la connut plus tard, était encore à naître." It did not, however, "start up on a sudden," as Hobbes imagined, out of the ruins of the Roman Empire. It had an antenatal existence. If the powers claimed for the Pope were slow in coming to maturity, their roots are found far back in the second century, when Victor threatened or attempted to put out of the communion of the Catholic Church the bishops of Asia who refused to fall in with the Roman practice about the date of Easter. Irenaeus rebuked him, and nothing came of the attempt. A hundred years later Stephen treated in the same way the African and Eastern bishops who disagreed with the Roman practice concerning the baptism of heretics. This time Dionysius the Great of Alexandria intervened to appease the strife, and was successful. Stephen seems to have taken his stand on the assertion that he was in a peculiar sense, as compared with other bishops, the successor of St. Peter, and therefore entrusted with an authority superior to theirs. Nothing more is heard of the claim for two centuries. In the year 347 the Council of Sardica, "in honour of St. Peter's memory," allowed a condemned bishop a limited appeal to the Bishop of Rome; but this appellate jurisdiction, being based on conciliar authority, is precisely analogous to that of metropolitans and patriarchs. In the year 451 St. Leo the Great renewed the claims of Stephen; the Council of Chalcedon welcomed his intervention with cries of "Peter has spoken by Leo," but in the last session the very men who led the acclamation, such as Eusebius of Dorylaeum, emptied it of meaning by the adoption of the 28th canon. In this it was asserted, with doubtful history, that "the fathers" of previous councils had "granted" precedence to

the Church of Rome on account of the imperial dignity of the city: "*Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα.*" The Roman legates at the Council protested, and the canon was never accepted at Rome. On the contrary, the claims put forward by Leo were pressed and enlarged by his successors, were sometimes allowed even by Eastern bishops, more often disallowed, and sometimes disputed or ignored even by Westerns. The Papacy, regarded as representing a superior authority in St. Peter, was an institution of slow and precarious growth. It is not on that account to be rejected as an ecclesiastical institution. Such also were diocesan episcopacy as we know it, and the parochial pastorate. It would certainly be within the competence of the Church to establish such a Papacy as the Gallican theologians and the Conciliar movement of the fifteenth century contemplated, an ecumenical patriarchate; but for a Vicariate of Christ set by divine authority above the episcopate I can find no evidence, but only a theological opinion always rejected by an important part of the Christian Church, and usually by the greater part.

## NOTE H

### *Πνεῦμα*

To understand the doctrine of the Spirit in the New Testament, and especially the Pauline antinomy of Spirit and Flesh, we must get away from the distinction of Spiritual and Material which is a commonplace of our present thought. This has been derived from Plato's radical division of *ψυχὴ* and *σῶμα*, of which he held *ψυχὴ* to be prior in time as well

as superior in value, and this again is intimately connected with the existence of separate ἰδέαι prior to sensible objects, which are formed by the communication of an ἰδέα to undifferentiated ὕλη. The basis of this physical theory was destroyed by Aristotle's mordant criticism, surviving as a moribund tradition in the Academy until it was revived, with a difference, in Neoplatonism.

Nothing of this kind is found in the Old Testament except a faint echo where the world is spoken of (Wisd. xi. 18) as created ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης. Neither was it accepted in the current philosophy of the period of the New Testament. Aristotle had disposed of the real existence of εἶδος and ὕλη as separables, these being arrived at only by the logical analysis of sensible reality. The same analysis appears in the Stoic distinction of ὕλη as τὸ πάσχον and πνεῦμα as τὸ ποιοῦν, where πνεῦμα certainly recalls the activity of the Platonic ἰδέα, but is not thought of as existing in separation; all that exists in reality is σῶμα, the intimate connexion of πνεῦμα and ὕλη.

The doctrine of Spirit in the New Testament is unquestionably derived from the Old Testament, not without some tincture of the dominant Stoicism of the day. "The Hebrew *rûaḥ*," says Swete,[1] "like the Greek πνεῦμα and the Latin *spiritus*, originally had a physiological and not a psychological value, denoting the human breath. But since the breath is the symbol of animal life, and in man is also the means of expressing emotion and thought, the word naturally passed into higher meanings, such as the principle of life as contrasted with the 'flesh' or material form; the seat of thought and desire, of the rational and moral nature of man. While *nephesh* (ψυχή, *anima*) is

[1] *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 2.

predicated freely of irrational animals as well as of human beings, *rûaḥ* is rarely used except in reference to man or to God, in whose image man was made. No Hebrew writer speaks of the 'soul' of God, but of the Spirit of God more frequent mention is made than of the spirit of man. The Spirit of God is the vital power which belongs to the Divine Being, and is seen to be operative in the world and in men. It is the Divine Energy which is the origin of all created life, and especially of human existence and the faculties of human nature." I gratefully transfer to my page this luminous statement, with reserve as to the use of the words "material form."

The Old Testament distinction of *rûaḥ* and *nephesh* is important as carried over to the conflict of πνεῦμα and σάρξ in Gal. v. 17, and to the contrast of ψυχικὸς and πνευματικὸς in 1 Cor. ii. 14, xv. 44. The ἄνθρωπος ψυχικὸς (unhappily rendered in the English Bible, after Luther,[1] by *natural*) is the animal man, controlled by those faculties of his nature which are summed up in the word ψυχή, contrasted with him who is guided by those other faculties which are collectively called πνεῦμα. By the Stoics both would be included under πνεῦμα, and it is not probable that St. Paul thought of them as distinct entities. It should be observed that in 1 Cor. iii. 1 he apparently makes σάρκινος equivalent to ψυχικὸς, and the phrase of 1 Thess. v. 23, ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, points rather to a recognition of the whole man as the only recognizable unit.

The influence of the Stoic vocabulary is seen in the

[1] It is only fair to say that Theophylact, borrowing as usual St. John Chrysostom's comment on the passage, adds an explanation of ψυχικὸς on his own account, τουτέστι φυσικός.

word *παλιγγενεσία* (Tit. iii. 5) of the work of the Spirit, though it is used in a wholly new sense. With the Stoics the dissolution and renewal of the *κόσμος* by fire at the end of the Great Year is *ἐκπύρωσις καὶ παλιγγενεσία* (Marcus Antoninus, *Comm.*, xi. 1, *τὴν περιοδικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν τῶν ὅλων*). In Matt. xix. 28 the word probably has its normal meaning. I have shown above (p. 63) that St. Paul rebounded from the Stoic immanentism of *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου* to the transcendental conception *τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ* (1 Cor. ii. 12).

## NOTE I

### *Ἀγάπη*

The word *ἀγάπη* was described by Grimm as "vox solum biblica et ecclesiastica," but Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, ch. ii.) has noted its occurrence in one or two texts of other origin, as restored with great probability. We can therefore no longer describe it as a term peculiarly Christian. Its current meaning must be inferred from etymological considerations and from the manner of its use.

The verb *ἀγαπᾶν* has a long history, from Homer onward. It is evidently connected with *ἄγασθαι*, which has the sense of *wonder* or *admiration*. It produces the substantives *ἀγάπησις* and *ἀγάπημα*, of rather late origin, the adjectives *ἀγαπητὸς*, already in Homer, and *ἀγαπητέος*, which we know from Plato. The relation of *ἀγάπη* and *ἀγαπᾶν* is therefore as normal as that of *τιμὴ* and *τιμᾶν*.

In *Odyss.*, xxi. 289, and xxiii. 214, *ἀγαπᾶν* signifies the courteous treatment of a stranger, in Euripides, *Suppl.*,

764, the honourable treatment of the dead. In Thucydides, vi. 36, *ἔγωγε ἀγαπᾶν οἶομαι αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐχ ἡμεῖς ἐπ' ἐκείνους ἐρχόμεθα*, means that the Athenians are only too well pleased at not being attacked by the Sicilian cities. In Plato, *Rep.*, v. 19, *ὑπο σμικροτέρων καὶ φαυλοτέρων τιμώμενοι ἀγαπῶσιν*, signifies a cheap delight in the praises of inferior men. *Ibid.*, ii. 1, *ἀγαπητέον* is a thing which gives the sense of beatitude. In *Oydss.*, ii. 365, *μοῦνος ἐὼν ἀγαπητὸς*, used of Telemachus as son, curiously anticipates a phrase of the Gospel, especially as *παῖς ἀγαπητὸς* is afterwards (iv. 817) used as if sufficiently descriptive. In Plato, *Protag.*, 48, the word has a diminishing force ; *κἂν εἰ ὀλίγον ἔστι τις ὅστις διαφέρει ἡμῶν προβιβάσαι εἰς ἀρετήν, ἀγαπητὸν*, it is satisfactory to make even a small advance.

There emerges the sense of regard or affection based on an estimate of value, moral or esthetic. It is doubtful whether *ἀγαπᾶν* ever even approximates to the emotional sense of *φιλεῖν* or the passion of *ἐρᾶν*, for *πόρνας ἀγαπᾶν* in Xen., *Memor*, i. 5 means only to be satisfied with such indulgence.

In the sapiential books of the Old Testament this meaning is conspicuous. In Wisd. i. 1 and vi. 13 *ἀγαπᾶν δικαιοσύνην* and *σοφίαν ἀγαπᾶν* speak for themselves. In iv. 10 *εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη*, and in Sirach iv. 13, *τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾶ ὁ κύριος*, is depicted God's delight in those who do his will. In the LXX version of the Song of Songs there are passages of an erotic character where *ἀγάπη* is used, perhaps for the purpose of giving them a less sensuous colour, as also in Jer. ii. 2. In Eccles. ix. 1 and Wisd. iii. 9, vi. 19, *ἀγάπη* appears to have its normal sense. Thus in the Old Testament the word found special

employment as signifying the good pleasure of God towards the chosen people.

The New Testament reproduces this thought at a higher level in the crucial phrase, *Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα*, Mark i. 12. Elsewhere the word *ἀγάπη* remains at a lower level, as in 1 Pet. iii. 10, *ζωὴν ἀγαπᾷν*, which can hardly mean more than to enjoy life, in however religious a sense. In Luke xi. 43, *ἀγαπᾶν τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν*, it even implies a respect for mean things. The characteristic Johannine phrase *ἀγαπᾶν τὸν κόσμον* appears in violently contrasted uses; *ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον* (John iii. 16), which implies the recognition of the possibilities of holiness which are in the world, and *μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον* (1 John ii. 15) which indicates an overvaluation of the world as it now is. Compare 2 Tim. iv., *ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα*.

But in the mouth of St. Paul the word *ἀγάπη* takes a new and definite colour. It is the affection which Christians ought to have for one another, evaluated as members of Christ. Here, again, it is clearly distinguished from *φιλεῖν* and its cognates. In the catalogue of virtues, 1 Peter i. 5–7, probably intended for an ascending scale, *ἀγάπη* stands as the crown above *φιλαδελφία*, where the Revised Version, "in your godliness love of the brethren, and in your love of the brethren love," is deplorable both in sound and in sense.

The Latin rendering *caritas* admirably emphasizes the idea of value, for *carus* is equivalent to the English *dear* in its two senses. In the absence of a corresponding verb, *diligere* with its sense of "esteem" was well chosen for *ἀγαπᾷν*. In English it would seem that no verb but the ambiguous *love* could be found, and the use of it has brought with it a tendency to abandon *charity*.

# NOTES

## NOTE K

### *Κοινωνία* [1]

When St. Luke wrote (Acts ii. 42) that the first Christian believers at Jerusalem steadfastly adhered *τῇ κοινωνίᾳ*, he may have been using a current designation of the Church, "the community" understood in a particular sense. It is equally possible that he was using the word in the general sense of what we may call "the common life"; the sense in which, with a difference, coenobitic monasteries were afterwards so named. This interpretation is borne out by his immediate addition of the statement that they had all things common (*κοινά*). The term *ἡ κοινωνία* will then stand for the experimental communism of those first days, which had no long continuance.

Both interpretations are checked by lack of support. If *ἡ κοινωνία* was ever a current designation of the Christian Church, perhaps anterior to the use of the word *ἐκκλησία*, it has left no other trace. Neither is it known to have been used, like *κοινότης*, of a communist ordering of society.

In any case the word had a Christian history behind it when St. Luke wrote, and of this we know something. We will consider the use of the word and its cognates in the books of the New Testament.

In Gal. ii. 9 we have the elder Apostles at Jerusalem giving to Paul and Barnabas *δεξιὰς κοινωνίας*, which means at least the recognition of them as sharing a common mission.

In Gal. vi. 6 the disciple is exhorted to give a share

[1] This Note contains part of a paper read to the Mürren Conference of September 1924.

(κοινωνείτω) of all good things to his teacher; this follows the injunction to bear one another's troubles (βάρη) qualified by the reminder that every one must carry his own proper load of responsibility (φορτίον). The meaning indicated, therefore, is mutual help, or interchange of advantages.

In 1 Cor. i. 9 believers are said to be called by God εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is unintelligible as it stands, but was apparently a phrase familiar to those to whom it was addressed. It is perhaps explained by Gal. iv. 5, where they are said to have been adopted as sons of God (τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολαμβάνειν) so as to become κληρονόμοι, or, in Rom. viii. 17, συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ, an idea which is abundantly illustrated elsewhere.

In 1 Cor. x. 14–28, where St. Paul is dealing with believers who were uneasy in conscience about entanglement in the worship of their heathen neighbours, those who eat of the sacrifices of Jewish worship are said to be κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, and immediately below those who eat of heathen sacrifices are correspondingly κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων. This correspondence is further explained by the words τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων. But the Corinthians were not concerned with Jewish sacrifices, and St. Paul extends the correspondence to a Christian rite: τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστί; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; and the word μετέχειν is here also used in explanation: ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. St. Paul is not strictly careful about his parallels. What is present to his mind all through is a common repast on the flesh of sacrificial victims; but "partaking of the altar" in the Jewish rite is not strictly

parallel to "partaking of the demons" in the Gentile rites. The comparison would be exact only on the assumption that the victim is identified with the God or Demon to whom it is offered, as in some of the Mysteries; and this idea is alien to the Jewish worship. But as between the Christian rite and the heathen rite, between the table of the Lord and the table of Demons, the comparison is closer; Christian worshippers share a sacred repast on sacrificial gifts which are identified with the Body and Blood of Christ.

In 2 Cor. vi. 14 *τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος* is a common hellenism and does not help us much except as limiting the idea of *κοινωνία* to the faithful.

In 2 Cor. viii. 4 *ἡ κοινωνία τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους* introduces a sense of the word which is found also in Rom. xv. 26. It is the despatch of alms from one local church to another, on which St. Paul laid stress as a token of unifying charity. In Heb. xiii. 16, *κοινωνία* seems to be internal almsgiving. So also, perhaps, in Rom. xii. 13, *ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες*. In Phil. iv. 14–16 *κοινωνεῖν* is used of contributions towards the maintenance of the Apostle himself. In 1 Tim. vi. 18, *κοινωνικὸς* is a man addicted to such charity, perhaps with a larger significance.

In Rom. xv. 27 *ἐκοινώνησαν*, the idea of mutuality is emphasized, and alms are treated as a return for spiritual blessings imparted.

In Eph. iii. 9, *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ μυστηρίου* is a reading of no authority, and I will not waste time on its very doubtful meaning.

In 2 Cor. i. 7 *κοινωνοὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως* sums up a picture of believers sharing both the

sufferings and the triumph of Christ, which is a frequent thought of St. Paul, recurring in Phil. iii. 10 *κοινωνίαν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ*, otherwise expressed in Rom. viii. 17, and largely explicated in Col. i. 24, *ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου*. Compare 1 Pet. iv. 13, *κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασι*, and v. 1, *δόξης κοινωνός*.

In Philem. 6 *ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου* seems to mean the consciousness of a common faith, which strengthens those labouring in the gospel, and *κοινωνὸν* in verse 17 may have the same implication. Compare *κοινὴν πίστιν*, Tit. i. 4; *κοινῆς σωτηρίας*, Jude, 3. One is inclined to think that *ἡ κοινωνία ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* in Phil. i. 5, means no less, but it may be only a reference to alms given for the Apostle's support. In 2 Cor. viii. 23, *κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς* is an actual partner in the apostolic ministry.

In 1 Tim. v. 22, *μηδὲ κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις* introduces the idea that members of the community may be affected by one another's sins, perhaps derived from St. Paul's apologue of the body in which, if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it.

In Phil. ii. 1 is the phrase *κοινωνία πνεύματος*. A modern reader is apt to make this mean the sharing of a common spirit, understanding "spirit" in the sense of psychological experience. But this use of *πνεῦμα* is foreign to the New Testament. Such "unity of spirit" is immediately below expressed by *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* or *τὸ ἓν φρονεῖν*, as also in 2 Cor. xiii. 11. Following St. Paul's thought, we must take *κοινωνία πνεύματος* to mean partaking of a certain principle of life, either inherent or a transcendent gift. Here, in the absence of an article, either meaning is possible. In the greeting at the end of 2 Cor. xiii. *ἡ κοινωνία*

τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος is specifically a sharing of the gift of the Divine Spirit.

From this it is no long step to 2 Pet. i. 4, where Christians are said to be θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, a phrase which sanctifies to Christian use a characteristic thought alike of the Greek mysteries and of Greek philosophy. Compare 1 John i. 3, ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

After this copious use of the word in the Apostolic writings, we find few, if any, traces of it in the Christian literature of the next age, even where we should most expect it, as in the epistles of Clement and Ignatius. The latter has κοινὴ ἐλπίς three times, κοινὸν ὄνομα once, κοινῇ three times adverbially of common or public action in the Church, εἰς τὸ κοινὸν once of ministering to the Church, and ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ once (Polyc., 4, 3), apparently of a common fund of the Church. Nothing more. Cf. *Epist. ad Diogn.*, 5, τράπεζαν κοινήν.

Justin Martyr, in the Dialogue with Trypho, has κοινωνεῖν ἁπάντων of Christian practice in contrast with Jewish exclusiveness. The absence of κοινωνία or κοινωνεῖν from his account of the Eucharist is the more conspicuous because of his use of κοινὸς there in a disparaging sense: "οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν." Against Trypho, however, he denies that Christians abstain from certain kinds of food as κοινὰ in the Jewish sense.

Irenaeus, when describing the agreement of Anicetus and Polycarp to differ about the date of Easter, says, Ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς, and the Roman bishop as a mark of respect allowed the bishop from Asia to take his place in the celebration of the Eucharist (Euseb., H. E. v. 24).

Thereafter the full meaning of *κοινωνία* and kindred words becomes normal; *γράμματα κοινωνικά*, *litterae communicatoriae*, were certificates showing that the bearer was in communion with the Church of the place from which he came, and was therefore to be recognized in like manner by every Church to which he might come, a bishop as bishop, a priest as priest, a layman as layman. The wide range of *κοινωνία* and *ἀκοινώνητος* in ecclesiastical Greek is shown in Suicer's articles on the two words.

Nothing less than this full meaning is satisfactory, and nothing less must be implied in that Intercommunion which should embrace the whole Church as one in the Bond of Peace.

# INDEX

# INDEX



*Printed in Great Britain by*
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING





Lacey, Thomas, Alex.
The One Body and the
One Spirit.